HOLY NAMES UNIVERSITY
PAUL J. CUSHING LIBRARY
library.hnu.edu
34681000738531

College of the
Holy Names

Library

Oakland - - California

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/fateofrepublics0000laur

COLLEGE OF THE HOLY NAMES
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

FATE OF REPUBLICS.

Townsend, Luther
"

"There is the moral of all human tales,
'Tis but the same rehearsal of the past,
First freedom, and then glory; when that fails,
Wealth, vice, corruption, — barbarism at last;
And History, with all her volumes vast,
Hath but one page."

BOSTON:
ESTES AND LAURIAT.
1880.

JC
421
T7

COPYRIGHT,
1880,
BY ESTES & LAURIAT.

28567

Electrotyped at the Boston Stereotype Foundry,
No. 4 Pearl Street.

TO

GENERAL ULYSSES S. GRANT.

INTRODUCTORY.

It is usual to classify governments under three types — government by one person, government by a few privileged persons, and government by the people; or, in a word, governments are either Monarchic, Aristocratic, or Democratic. The extreme poles of government are, therefore, pure despotisms on the one hand, and pure democracies on the other. Between these two extremes are found most of the extinct and existing forms of government.

In history, nearly all governments, not monarchical, are termed Republics. Sparta, during her independence, especially while under the rule of the Magistrates and Senate; Athens, just after the times of Solon; and the Italian republics, notably those of Venice and Genoa, were so thoroughly governed by the aristocracy, that by some writers they have been excluded from the rank of republics; still, in this treatise they are regarded as republics.

It is worthy of note also that republics are of two types — centralized and non-centralized. When the general government represents the sovereignty of the people, independent of local governments, and when the power of the whole nation — as in case of France and the republics of South America — is exercised by a general government,

we have what is termed a centralized republic. But when the general government — as, for instance, that of the Greek republics, the free cities of Germany, and the United States — is restricted constitutionally so as not to control or interfere in certain respects with the local governments of the several states, and when the voice of the different states is necessary in order to accomplish certain measures in behalf of the general government — then the republic is termed non-centralized.

Contents.

PAGE

Introductory 1

PART I.

EXTINCT REPUBLICS; ANCIENT DATE.

CHAPTER

I. Israelitish Commonwealth 5

II. Grecian Republics 12

III. Carthage 28

IV. Rome 36

PART II.

EXTINCT REPUBLICS; MEDIEVAL AND MODERN DATE.

CHAPTER

I. Lombard Communes; Genoa; Venice; Amalfi; Free Cities of Germany; Iceland . . . 61

II. Republic of the United Provinces; French Republic of 1792–1804 81

PART III.

EXISTING REPUBLICS; EXCLUSIVE OF THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER PAGE

I. European Republics.
San Marino; Andorra; Switzerland; France 97

II. African Republics.
Liberia; Orange River Free State; Transvaal Republic 114

III. American Republics.
i. Mexico.
ii. Central America: Guatemala; Honduras; San Salvador; Nicaragua; Costa Rica, 118

IV. American Republics (*Continued*).
i. South America: Venezuela; Colombia; Ecuador; Peru; Bolivia; Paraguay; Argentine Republic; Uruguay; Chili.
ii. Hayti and San Domingo 131

PART IV.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

CHAPTER

I. National Government 159
II. Supposed Securities 163
III. Existing Perils. Popery 176
IV. " " Social Evils 214
V. " " Political Evils 230

NOTES 255

I.

EXTINCT REPUBLICS; ANCIENT DATE.

Fate of Republics.

CHAPTER I.

I. LOMBARD COMMUNES. — II. GENOA. — III. VENICE. — IV. AMALFI. — V. FREE CITIES OF GERMANY. — VI. ICELAND.

The Israelitish Commonwealth, one of the earliest republics of which history gives account, appears to have sprung up, under providential circumstances, from the instinctive Israelitish love of political and religious independence. This constitutional love of liberty in the Jewish nation can be traced a long way back, even to the times of Abraham, who left his home in Babylonia (1921 B. C.), and sought in the then new and western world — the wilds of Palestine — a home where he could enjoy the rights of political and religious freedom. The patriarchal, or family government, continued until the settlement of the Israelites in Egypt. The leading Israelitish minds never submitted gracefully to their Egyptian serfdom, and under Moses the people revolted and escaped from bondage. The period that followed, including nearly four hundred years (1491–1095 B. C.), and extending to the appointment of Saul as king, witnessed what is termed the Israelitish Commonwealth, or Republic. During the administration of Moses and Joshua the government was of the consolidated and

centralized type.[1]* Except in the priesthood, there was no office-holding class having privileged rights. Political preferment depended upon neither mature age, wealth, aristocratic birth, nor sex. The people, by popular vote in what was termed the "congregation of Israel," strictly, the popular assembly, adopted the form of government instituted, ratified laws, imposed taxes, and chose their leaders and judges. In this Hebrew commonwealth we have, therefore, the earliest historic record of choosing rulers by elective franchise. The government was beneficent and wise. Oppression was rigorously prohibited. The security of person and property was sought by what have been termed Draconic measures, though they were no more severe than the laws of England during the eighteenth century. "A spirit of strict justice, combined with charity and humanity," extending to servants, strangers, and even to the lower animals, breathed throughout the Mosaic code.[2] Schools similar to the common, district, or parochial schools of modern times were found, according to the ablest Jewish commentators, in every Israelitish community. The Levites and the priests taught the child first to read, then to repeat the sacred precepts of their religion.

Owing to the extraordinary fertility of the soil and the mildness of the climate, the Jewish commonwealth was independent of foreign commerce. The state was communistic, so far that to each family was assigned twenty-one and a half acres of land, the common law of the republic making this land inalienable; if mortgaged or sold, this assigned estate reverted, without repurchase, upon the year

* The marks [1], [2], [3], &c., refer the reader to Supplemental Notes, page 255.

of jubilee, to the original proprietor. It was this remarkable Agrarian law which secured political equality and prevented the vast accumulations of land estate in the hands of the few, that has led to so much distress in the republics of later date. Here was an illustration of Machiavelli's great political maxim, "the constant renovation of the state according to the first principles of its constitution."

The Israelitish law had also provided against the evils of excessive rates of interest: usury in any form was strictly forbidden.[3] The state was thus preserved from those fierce struggles between creditors and debtors which have contributed to the downfall of the most renowned republics of history. The only public resource of the commonwealth was that of the sacred treasury, and the chief public expenditure was for religious worship.

The military spirit was fostered; all Israel capable of bearing arms constituted the standing army.[4] At the outset, this republic consisted, for the most part, of an independent yeomanry, who herded their flocks in the vales and on the hill-sides, and cultivated their hereditary farms, the boundaries of which were not allowed to be moved.

The republic during these early periods, as would be expected, was one of the most prosperous countries of antiquity. Each man, in the beautiful language of the times, "dwelt under his own vine and fig-tree." We cannot well dissent from the opinion of one who has carefully studied this period of Israelitish history, that "the descendants of Abraham had reached a higher state of virtue and happiness, under their republic, than any other nation of that period." Had the consolidation

which first characterized the government, and those early political, social, and religious customs and virtues continued, there was certainly no nationality in the Orient which could favorably compare with this early Hebrew republic.

But these domestic virtues and this republican administration did not continue. Unfortunately, on the death of Joshua there was no successor either chosen or appointed over the united tribes or states of Israel. Love for the union, among the different tribes, soon gave place to individual state love and rights; and the united republic submitted to the peril of a peaceable secession of the different states, forming several independent confederacies. During these periods of disintegration arose the warlike leaders of Israel, called the Judges, the *Shofetim*, who closely resemble the *Suffetes*, or rulers of the Carthaginian republic of later date. They were essentially military dictators, appointed during great emergencies to command the national forces. Their selection was confined to no particular state of the confederacy; they were chosen on account of personal valor and for the purpose of defending the common cause. The government, when threatened by invasion, would for a time seem quite thoroughly consolidated. But a republic once infected with the theory of state or tribal rights is with difficulty, if at all, entirely cured. A political disturbance, a national misfortune, some real or imaginary local injustice, is sure to create fresh demands for disunion. Thus it was with Israel. Shortly after a common danger passed, there was found some pretext, and one state after another set up its plea of independency and withdrew from the federal compact and leadership.

Thus matters continued for three hundred and fifty years. The student of history will always have occasion to wonder that the Jewish state, having such diverse sectional and tribal interests, could so long survive. If supernatural interposition ever can be predicated of human affairs, it must be that the Hebrew republic was divinely preserved during these periods of civil disunion. But at length Providence seemed no longer to interfere. A division of interests weakened the Israelites and made them an easy prey to surrounding tribes. They were so much engaged in war, especially in repelling invasions, that their general system of education was neglected. The religion of their fathers, amid the darkness of increasing ignorance, gave place to idolatry. Rulers became faithless to their trusts, were self-seeking and often oppressive. Under the pious administration of Samuel, ending 1095 B. C., these fatal tendencies were for a time arrested. The people repented of their idolatry, re-enacted the laws of Moses, and nearly, if not entirely, secured a restoration of the federal union; there was consequently a period of great prosperity in the Commonwealth of Israel.

By reason of the infirmities of the aged Samuel, his sons, Joel and Abiah, were appointed to assist in the administration of affairs. They were at first odious, simply by reason of their excessive extortions. But at length they defied the laws of the commonwealth; they made a mockery of justice, and substituted their own arbitrary will for the law of the land. Subordinates in office caught the spirit of their superiors, and became exacting and tyrannical. Amid such scenes, the wronged people clamored for a change of government. They dared to welcome absolutism, hoping

that with it would come security of person and property. The "congregation of Israel" waited upon Samuel and demanded a king. That noble republican patriot protested; he vividly portrayed the perils, the exactions and oppressions which would inevitably result sooner or later from the despotisms of an absolute monarchy. His words availed nothing. The people had suffered, as they thought, too much from misgovernment, bad rulers, and from conflicts arising out of the disunion of states, to listen to the counsels of the great judge and prophet. They felt that the "despotism of one man was preferable to the tyranny of many." A change they would have. Instead of removing corrupt rulers, as was within their power, and instead of retaining their republican form of government, as they might have done, they dared the risks: they demanded a king.

The will of the people being the highest law of the land, there was no course for Samuel except to yield to the popular verdict. The Israelites had thus proved themselves unfit to live longer under a beneficent republic, and Providence no longer interposed. Only a moment's reflection is necessary to show that popular ignorance and popular irreligion lay at the bottom of these unfortunate demands and measures.

From some cause, Moses, anticipating the end of the federal government of Israel, provided what has never been provided in any other republic, namely, regulations for the election of a king and for the administration of the affairs of a kingdom. So ample were the legal arrangements, so ripe were the people for the change, and, fortunately, so wise was the course of Samuel, that the revolution was

effected without bloodshed or tumult, and Saul was anointed king.

Prosperity attended the affairs of the new kingdom through the subsequent reigns of David and Solomon. King succeeded king; and, as is often the case, kings after a time became tyrants, and the Israelites awoke to their appalling wretchedness, cursed with the evils of absolute despotism. Under such a gloomy cloud, the first republic of the world fades from history.

CHAPTER II.

GRECIAN REPUBLICS.

THE most ancient inhabitants of Greece, as is generally believed, were the Pelasgians. History shows that they were not barbarians, but tillers of the soil and dwellers in walled towns. Greece in the Heroic Age was divided into several states or tribes, each ruled by a chief, whose power was similar to that exercised by the Old Testament patriarchs. There were three classes of citizens — nobles, common freemen, and slaves. Family relations were tender, habits were simple, general intelligence was on the increase, the stranger was given hospitality, and the suppliant was afforded protection.

Soon after the commencement of the first Olympiad, the ancient reverence for kings in nearly all the tribes gradually lost its hold upon the mass of the people, and in an incredibly brief space of time they were all deposed. It is very remarkable that most of these revolutions from monarchy to republicanism were effected without bloodshed, and with but slight remonstrance from the nobility.

"Sometimes, on the death of a king, his son was acknowledged as ruler for life, or for a certain number of

years, with the title of Archon; and sometimes the royal race was set aside altogether, and one of the nobles was elected to supply the place of the king, with the title of Prytanis, or president."

Once embarked in these political changes, it was found difficult to arrest still further encroachments of the commonalty upon the privileges and claims of the ruling classes. When monarchy gives place to oligarchy, the logical and historical sequence is that the oligarchy must give place to democracy. During the period extending from B. C. 650 to 500, nearly every city in Greece had become dissatisfied with the ruling few, and ambitious citizens, called Despots, seized the reins of government. The Sicyonian, Corinthian, and Megarian despots were among the most celebrated. No instance is known, however, where a Grecian "despot" established a permanent dynasty. During these civil revolutions, Sparta alone, after throwing off the monarchical, retained an oligarchical form of government. Lycurgus could have easily made himself dictator more easily than had most of the despots in other states, but he chose the wiser course of enacting such laws as would place Sparta among the most powerful of the Greek commonwealths. Still, had the Spartans been less a nation of soldiers, not despising, as they did, art and literature, they probably would have yielded to the spirit of the age, and upon the ruins of an oligarchy have established a democracy.

It would be interesting, did our limits allow, or did the object of this treatise require, to study separately the history of Sparta, and of each of the other ten or twelve commonwealths. We must group them.

We call attention, first, to the fact that no nationality has had more inspiring, beautiful, or defensible territories than the Greeks. The poetic beauty and romance of the mountains of Greece have never failed to call forth the admiration of visitors. That country of unsurpassed natural scenery, surrounded on every hand, excepting upon the northern frontier, by the Mediterranean, whose bays and gulfs indented the entire coast, giving to every state, excepting Arcadia, a seaport, was the best adapted possible for the development of a race of bold mountaineers and enterprising mariners, classes always regarded as among the most valuable in the defence of national rights and liberties.

Athens, the queen city of Greece, was delightfully situated.[5] No doubt her location contributed much towards her acknowledged superiority among all the other Grecian states.

In the age of Thucydides, Athens had risen to such a degree of political importance that she exercised a sort of sovereignty in Greece, and became also the centre of literary and scientific culture. The pure democratic polity of the republic gave to popular eloquence the greatest freedom, and thus the language of Athens reached a completeness, comprehensiveness, and influence to which no other dialect of Greece attained. Every freeman was trained in logic, rhetoric, and oratory, so as to be able, before Athenian jurors, and without the aid of a consul, to defend himself. From all the other states, Greeks repaired to Athens for their education. The consequence was that the Attic dialect became the court language, the general language of books, and, from the date of the

Macedonian conquest, it was adopted by the prose writers of all the Grecian tribes and countries.

As would be expected, the Athenian state for centuries took precedence in matters of taste and culture. There is found to have been an almost uninterrupted progress in literature and art, indeed, in all forms of mental culture and development, from the earliest dawn of the state until the downfall of her political independence. She is acknowledged to have been the mother of refinement, the nurse of literature, the patron of art, and the founder of European civilization.

In one century, from 530 to 430 B. C., Attica produced the following illustrious persons: Themistocles, Miltiades, Aristides, Cimon, Pericles, Xanthippus, Thucydides, Socrates, Xenophon, Plato, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and Phidias. It is generally conceded that in two thousand years all Europe has not seen their equals.

In a word, here is a republic whose career is magnificent, indeed, almost dazzling. And yet Greece, which should have had her political power centralized in Attica; Greece, so beautiful, so strong, so enterprising, which had combined strength enough to resist any invasion the world could have attempted; that country, at one time having the most flourishing republican institutions known to history, entirely lost her independence. She first yielded to her Macedonian masters, then to Persia, then to Rome, then to the Goths and Vandals, then to the Popes, then to the Moslems, under whose rule the common people were condemned to seemingly hopeless slavery and degradation. And to-day Greece is nothing but a petty and poverty-stricken

kingdom whose assumptions of royalty are well-nigh ridiculous.[6]

Comparing Greece as she was centuries ago with what she is to-day, a pertinent question confronts us — What are the causes which have wrought these changes? Why did not Greece resist invasions? Why did she not suppress insurrections? Why did she not punish traitors? and, Why did she not maintain her liberties?

In answering these questions, we group into two classes the causes that led to her downfall. *First*, the unrestrained tendencies of human nature. *Second*, certain fundamental defects in the constitution of the Grecian states. Under the first class we note the blight that is apt to come upon a state in consequence of the rapid increase of wealth. Even Sparta felt this evil almost as much as did Attica and the other states. The treasures of conquered cities, subsidies granted by Persia to aid in the overthrow of Athenian supremacy, and bribes paid the influential citizens of Sparta, created a widespread passion for money and for indulgence in all sorts of extravagance. The rich sought more and more for the luxuries of the Orient, and by their mode of living, more and more separated themselves from the poor. The poor sought by every means at command to gain such wealth as would relieve them from social degradation and ostracism. In the hearts of nearly all a feverish cupidity took the place of noble moral purpose and of patriotism, and the race of Spartan heroes at length disappeared.[7]

In other of the Grecian states the story is substantially the same. Wealth, oftener gained dishonestly than otherwise, led its possessors to perpetrate gross wrongs upon

the less successful. Advantage was freely taken of the necessities of the poor. Interest on loans rose in the different states as high as thirty-six per cent. The rich in consequence became richer and the poor poorer; the social gulf widened and deepened in every respect between these two classes. It is, therefore, no matter of wonder that the poor became discontented and looked upon the wealth and political power of those who stood above them with sullen anger. Measures, however unjust, that promised a redistribution of property were hailed and demanded by the democratic rabble. Any demagogue who sided with these irritable masses, and who promised legislation that would relieve their distresses, was the hero of the hour, and by the suffrages of the people was at length elevated to the most responsible positions.[8] Men basely notorious, cruel, and bloodthirsty — such as Cleon, of Athens, Cypselus and Periander, of Corinth, and Thrasybulus, of Miletus — could sway and infuriate at will the popular heart. Robbery, more than once, in more than one way and in more than one state, was legalized. The rich were sometimes forced by popular vote to provide oxen and goats for public sacrifices; the larger portion of the flesh would, however, be distributed for food to the mob.

At other times, after some so-termed liberal party victory had been gained, the rabble would enter the houses of the rich and force them to provide costly banquets; they confiscated the property of the nobles and drove them into exile; they repudiated all debts, and forced their aristocratic creditors to refund any interest that had been paid. It resulted that those who possessed property, exasperated by such injustice, would often side with a dictator or

tyrant, who was thought able to relieve from the worst kind of tyranny and despotism — that of a mob. Nor is it a matter of surprise, when the homes and the property of the aristocracy and the rich are no longer safe, that those imperilled lose their love for the government, and are willing, nay, anxious, to surrender it to any one who can establish order. Amid such changes, the mob usually, in the end, gains no advantage and inevitably sinks to the bottom.

The misfortunes of Greece just before her downfall were not solely the outgrowth of conflicts between wealth and poverty. Ambitious aspirants for office also were an unmitigated curse throughout the Grecian states. As would be expected, the jealousies and animosities springing up between leading men became such that the ruin of the country would be allowed sooner than the success of a rival. Patriotism, even in case of men having many noble qualities, seemed at length to give place entirely to self-seeking. The success of Miltiades at Marathon is said to have robbed Themistocles of his sleep. Themistocles and Aristides had such mutual jealousies that each would have preferred national defeat rather than victory at the hands of his rival.[9]

Political factions, based upon various, and often upon unimportant issues, likewise became a very turbulent element in the different Grecian states. The condition of Sparta after Alexander had taken command of the confederate Greeks was especially gloomy. Agis IV., while endeavoring to reform the state, was put to death by the Ephors. Cleomenes came into power, and in turn put to death the Ephors; nay, more, he crushed the oligarchy, extended the state franchise, and redistributed the landed

property. These rude democratic measures were followed by the reign of tyrants who were upheld by foreign mercenaries, and who in many instances, to maintain their position, resorted to the most merciless measures.[10]

The constitution of the other Grecian states had likewise grown more and more democratic and turbulent, until at length the lowest persons and the lewdest in all public matters had equal voice and rights with the noblest citizens. This unrestricted franchise was followed, as was natural, by laxity in the selection of proper persons to fill public positions; then, of course, came an end of political virtue and justice. A score of demagogues were found in strife for positions which only one could occupy. The party of the *shore*, and the party of the *plain*, and the party of the *mountain*, the *war* parties, and the *peace* parties, would each in turn be successful, aggressive, and tyrannical.

Amid these political contentions the worst passions of the masses were developed, and the worst classes rose for a time into a commanding and terrible importance. First one party, then another, would promise freedom and political rights to slaves and to foreigners who were utterly unqualified for the rights and privileges of franchise. Prisons were thrown open and the most desperate convicts set at large; nay, were supplied with arms and with votes in order to carry or enforce some political measure. At length leaders and parties defiantly sought victory, and gained it by resort to misrepresentations, frauds, and violence. There were times in Grecian history when no other methods were tried, or deemed of any use.

Often the successful party, in order to retain power and remove opposition, wreaked fearful vengeance upon the

defeated. Whenever the interests of the dominant party seemed to require the arrest of some prominent leader of the opposition, there was needed only the testimony of a hireling wretch in order to secure execution. Sometimes these death sentences were executed publicly, so as to terrify those who might sympathize with the doomed; at other times the utmost secrecy was observed. When the Spartan Ephors sought the extermination of the Helots, after their public emancipation, the arrests and executions were made by secret orders; one after another disappearing, no one pretending to know how or why. It was the same in Athens. Citizens were continually falling during great political controversies. "Yet," says the historian, "no man could tell whose hand struck the blow nor whose turn might come next."

The history of the "Four Hundred," and that of "The Thirty," disclose the same fearful and bloody condition of affairs. During the domination of each of these bodies there was no show of justice, no trial, often no testimony, simply arbitrary butchery.

There was a statute regulation in early times that any citizen of Athens who neglected the national assembly would be subjected to a fine. But these assemblies, once orderly, became so tumultuous and dangerous that respectable citizens shunned them. Their presence, while in a helpless minority, would have secured no benefit to the state, and would have imperilled their own safety. The turbulent democracy, after the death of Pericles, would not listen to reason. The mob became despotic, tyrannical, and easily inflamed by ambitious demagogues against men of opulence, eminence, and respectability

whenever appearing in public or attempting any patriotic service.[11]

As would be expected, the ancient order of Solon, that there should be no evil speaking in the state, was disregarded, and the atmosphere was filled with abusive language. Those who had rendered the most distinguished services did not escape. Nor is it surprising that such abuse often resulted in disheartening and alienating even devout patriots, making of them national foes. The slightest defects or mistakes were exaggerated and made a ground for slander, ostracism, or death. Patriotic and important services were overlooked or forgotten. Indeed, the men who had done most for the state often fared the worst.

Miltiades, the hero of Marathon, whose honors aroused the animosity of those opposed to him, for a single mistake was tried, condemned, and thrust into prison, where he died.

Themistocles, one of Athens' most brilliant soldiers and statesmen, who had spent the better years of his life in fortifying and beautifying the city, through persecution turned traitor. No doubt he had made some mistake, for who has not? He may have been unduly exasperated by his opponents; still no one doubts that he had devoutly loved Athens and Greece. But, by reason of political oppositions, he was compelled to go into banishment, wandering as a fugitive from country to country. Is it a matter of wonder, therefore, when at length he firmly believed his ungrateful country was inevitably doomed, that he should offer to betray her into the hands of the Persians?

Under the misrepresentations of popular demagogues, such as Eucrates, the rope-maker, Lysicles, the sheep-dealer, Hyperbolus, the lamp-maker, and Clion, the cruel and cowardly tanner, Pericles, a patriot of unquestioned and untarnished purity, whom Cicero regarded as the first example in the world's history of a perfect orator, who had contributed so largely to Athenian greatness, was obliged to employ all his masterly powers of mind and eloquence to stem the torrent of public indignation aroused against him by these brutal democrats. Into such condition had the republic degenerated. If the tide continued to set in that direction, the ruin of the state was only a question of time.

The second class of causes which led to the downfall of Grecian independence, was a defect in the national constitution. Greece, including the different states, was a small country, its greatest length not more than two hundred and fifty English miles, its greatest breadth only one hundred and eighty. Its safety against foreign invasion depended, therefore, upon a form of government such as could unite all the states under one federal compact. There seems to be no valid reason why there should not have been such a union. These states had many ties to bind them together, such as community of blood and language, manners and character, together with religious rites and festivals. They had, likewise, national councils and leagues. But the Amphictyonic, the most noted, though approaching a Greek national congress, and such leagues as the Bœotian, Æolian, and Delian, did not in the least interfere with the extremest views of independent state rights. There was nothing strong enough in these assemblies to

combine the efforts of the Greek states permanently against the Persian monarchs, the Macedonian kings, or against the Roman legions. The patriotism of the Greek was confined rather to his own section, rarely kindling into love for the weal of the whole country. One state sometimes became prominent enough to exercise authority over neighboring states, but no lasting bond of union was formed or, apparently, desired.

Hence the temporary dominion of Thebes over the cities of Bœotia, and of Athens over her subject allies, was always submitted to with reluctance, and was thrown off upon the first opportunity. So radical was the political disunion among Greek cities, that the citizen of one, if he visited another, was looked upon as an alien. There was social ostracism whenever a northern Greek visited the south, or when an eastern Greek visited the west. Easily, therefore, could the Greek cities be led to take up arms against one another, almost as easily as against a foreign foe.

There is, therefore, no ground for doubt that one of the fundamental defects in the Grecian commonwealths was this want of a centralized form of government. Greek would not unite with Greek. They would not recognize a national supremacy. They professed primal loyalty to the individual state. Each city of the national council or league sought those measures only which would contribute most to its individual interests, without regard to the interests of other cities or those of the entire nationality. It was a disunion of states, and a consequent conflict of political interests and jealousies, a blundering states'-rights policy, which at length contributed so largely to Grecian

weakness as to render her an easy prey to any foe that might assail. Sparta, at the south, "the citadel of oligarchy," and Athens, at the north and east, "the champion of democratic government," were especially antagonistic to each other. Sparta sought to force an oligarchy upon all her dependencies and allies; Athens as zealously sought to force pure democracies upon every state subject to her empire. In this conflict of political ideas, Sparta was the first to exercise a sort of empire of opinion over the other states. Then, after the Persian wars, Athens contested the palm with Sparta, and, through the confederacy of Delos, stood, at least in the matter of material power, at the head of the Grecian states. Then Sparta, jealous of Athenian supremacy, formed a league with certain other states for the purpose of crushing Athens. After a protracted struggle, Athens fell and Sparta again ruled Greece, maintaining her supremacy for about thirty years. In the mean time, Thebes had been growing in power and influence, and, through the ability and genius of Epaminondas, her leading general, struck Sparta a stunning blow, and wrested from her the Grecian supremacy. The ascendency of Thebes was followed in turn by that of Athens. But Greece was then so far exhausted by these internal dissensions and conflicts that she "condescended to throw herself at the feet of Persia," making of that ancient and hereditary foe an arbiter of her quarrels. Macedonia had hitherto been looked upon by the Grecian states as a despised and barbarous territory, unworthy of rank within the pale of Greek civilization. Philip, acute, sagacious, somewhat cultivated, commanding and eloquent,

assumed, at the age of twenty-three, the government of Macedonia.

Athens, struggling to maintain independent supremacy, and involved in the so-called "Social War," and in various insurrections, was greatly crippled, losing some of her ablest commanders. The so-termed "Sacred War" was at the same time raging among other Grecian states.

Thus wars, jealousies among commanders, repeated insurrections, and disunion, combined in laying Greece at the feet of Philip. He first made a conquest of Thessaly. At this point Demosthenes uttered his prophetic warnings. He tried to persuade the Athenians to form a union with other Grecian states, and arm against a common foe. His warnings and entreaties produced only a temporary effect upon the heedless and wrangling Athenians. Personal safety for the day or hour seemed the height of Athenian ambition and the extent of Athenian foresight. Most unfortunate was it also, amid these scenes and dangers, that military service was no longer rendered by patriotic citizens, but by hired soldiery. Young men had lost all martial taste, and aliens garrisoned the most important fortifications of Greece. Public revenues were frittered away in useless and needless expeditions, instead of upon fleets and armies. Greece at length was left well-nigh destitute of all physical defences. Nothing standing in the way, Macedon became the leading state, and in 335 B. C. Alexander, Philip's son, placed the Macedonian yoke heavily upon the neck of every state in Greece. Later, the Macedonian empire becoming involved with other powers, the Achæans seized upon the occasion, and in 281 B. C. were successful in freeing themselves. Subse-

quently the patriotism and military genius of Philopœmen nearly secured the federal union of all the Grecian states; but it was too late. There was not enough of patriotism, self-sacrifice, and nobility left among the Greeks to constitute a united nationality. The conquering Romans crushed the Macedonian power, and, almost without resistance, swept over the country (B. C. 146), and the states constituting the last Grecian league, the Achæan, were completely vanquished.

Athens was the last to yield. Almost single-handed she confronted the Roman general Sylla, but soon found that her martial defences offered but the feeblest resistance against the successful Romans. The Athenians next attempted to check Sylla by a method quite characteristic: they sent their orators to try upon the resolute general the arts of eloquence.

"Admitted to an audience, the spokesman began to remind the general of their past glory, and was proceeding to touch upon Marathon, when the surly soldier fiercely growled, 'I was sent here to punish rebels, not to study history.' And he did punish them. He broke down the wall between the Persians and the Sacred Gate, and poured in his soldiers to punish and slay. With drawn swords they swept through the streets. The ground ran with blood, which poured its horrid tide into the ancient burying-place of the Ceramicus. Great numbers of the citizens were slain; their property was plundered by the soldiers. The groves of the Academy and the Lyceum were cut down; and columns were carried away from the temple of Olympian Zeus to ornament the city of Rome."

The epitaph of the Grecian republics is easily written: The luxury and extravagance attendant upon wealth and upon other forms of national prosperity; general laxity in morality and religion; jealousies and discontents incident to poverty; conflicts between different political parties, each willing to sacrifice the safety of the state, and even the state itself, sooner than allow a competitor to succeed; abuse allowed to be heaped upon patriots by political opponents; favors shown, even to traitors and to the most dangerous classes, when they could be used to promote party interests; a disunion of states constantly embroiled with one another through conflicting interests, — these are the reasons why that country, which rose to such eminence, and which might have remained a strong republic to this day, fell into degradation and ruin.

And while this Grecian history can be studied, it is singular that modern republics will not read the lessons and take warning!

"Out of the clouds the snowflakes are poured, and fury of hail-storm;
After the lightning's flash, follows the thunderous bolt.
Tossed by the winds is the sea, though now so calmly reposing,
Hushed in a motionless rest, emblem of justice and peace.
So is the state by its great men ruined, and under the tyrant
Sinks the people unwise, yielding to slavery's thrall;
Nor is it easy to humble the ruler too highly exalted,
After the hour is passed: *now* is the time to foresee."[12]

CHAPTER III.

CARTHAGE.

Passing from the Greek republics to the Commonwealth of Carthage, we are in an historic field of which we have less data, but enough to show that some of the national perils found in the Grecian states have likewise their African counterpart. The records of early Carthage are lost. We may safely presume, however, that the founders were a race of freedom-loving refugees, who had suffered religious and political persecutions in ancient Tyre. Their descendants, no doubt, regarded them as we do the Pilgrim Fathers. Five hundred years before Christ this Carthaginian republic is found flourishing under rulers and generals, not possessed of hereditary rights and privileges, but subject to election from the people. While the Great Council, the chief legislative body, during the closing days of the republic, appears to have been somewhat aristocratic, and the Council of the Elders even more so, still there is no evidence that the popular voice, when very pronounced, was ever opposed, and there is conclusive evidence that it was often obeyed, even when it involved great sacrifice on the part of the wealthy and aristocratic.

The government for centuries appears to have been conducted with skill, securing internal tranquillity and resulting in systematic foreign and commercial aggrandizement. There was a liberal administration; there were courts of justice, banking institutions, public libraries, and also schools of literature and art.[13] Her republican form of government was not split up, like that of Greece, into petty and jealous states, each clamorous for its rights and independence, but was centralized like that of Rome and of France.

At the time when the struggle between Rome and Carthage commenced, Rome was semi-barbarous, Carthage highly civilized; Rome was comparatively poor, grasping, and eager for conquest, Carthage rich, radiant with the arts and spoils of the East; Rome was seeking for new territory and was murdering her subjects, Carthage was making discoveries and spreading the genius of commerce; Rome had an army, Carthage had both an army and a navy; Rome was master of the northwest, Carthage of the northeast; Rome was a nation of laborers and soldiers, Carthage a nation of merchants and mariners; Rome was seeking to rule with sword and spear, Carthage with her gold and commerce. Carthage could also boast of agricultural resources such as were matched by but few other countries of antiquity. The soil of some of her island dependencies was extremely fertile, while that of her African territories was unsurpassed. And, what is no less encouraging, some of the first families of the republic, during the early days of her ascendency, took pride in being classed with those who cultivated the arts of husbandry.

The city of Carthage, the capital of the republic, was situated upon the shores of a bay of the Mediterranean, and at the time of its greatest prosperity outranked all other contemporary cities of the world, both as a maritime power and commercial emporium. The city, with its streets and gardens, covered a peninsula twenty-three miles in circuit, and was guarded by a triple wall with interior casemates, which housed three hundred elephants, five thousand horses, and twenty thousand infantry. In times of peace thousands of vessels could anchor safely in the bay of Tunis. In times of danger they could shelter themselves in a harbor fourteen hundred feet long and eleven hundred feet broad, which opened, by an entrance seventy feet wide, into an inner harbor for ships of war, surrounded by quays, with docks for two hundred and twenty galleys. The Carthaginian loved his country as a whole, while Carthage, the metropolis, was almost revered. It was to the republic what Paris is to France.

The conquests of the republic in the days of her ascendency were of immense magnitude. She acquired dominion over the Phœnician colonies of North Africa; over the Libyans and native Numidians; she conquered Sardinia, regarded by the ancients as the "greatest of all islands," also Elba, Malta, and the western half of Sicily. Corsica, if not hers, was at least closed by her to all other states. She was mistress of the Ægatian, Liparean, Balearic, and Pityusian Isles, and in the course of time Spain, which was then the richest country of the known world, became part of the Carthaginian empire. She pushed her armies into Italy, often sending terror into the Roman heart, even in the days when that republic was considered almost

the ruler of the world. In the battle of Cannæ, though the Roman forces doubled those of the Carthaginians, the Carthaginians were overwhelmingly victorious; history says that Hannibal, after that battle, sent home three bushels of gold rings taken from the bodies of the Roman dead. Hannibal remained in Italy seventeen years, engaged in many encounters, but was always victorious. In her palmy days, Carthage did not confine her spirit of enterprise merely to war and conquest, but she sent expeditions to the coast of Guinea, and advanced beyond the mouths of the Senegal and the Gambia. The Carthaginians discovered a passage around the Cape of Good Hope two thousand years before its subsequent discovery by Dias and Vasco da Gama. Her merchant ships passed beyond the Pillars of Hercules and through the British Channel. Her freight caravans crossed the deserts to the valleys of the Nile and the Niger.

Carthage was also well off in her list of distinguished public men and resolute patriots. Hamilcar, Asdrubal, Hannibal, and Xanthippus, the Greek, are names of which any people may well be proud. It is not uncommon for those who have carefully studied these subjects to render the verdict that Hannibal was a greater general than Cæsar, Marlborough, or even Alexander, and that his sole equal in military history is Napoleon. But the father, Hamilcar, was unquestionably greater than Hannibal the son. The father and son are unapproached for greatness by any two Greeks or any two Romans that can be named.

Such was the Carthaginian commonwealth in the days of her glory.

A few years later, her African territories had become a granary for the Roman people, a hunting-ground for their amphitheatres, and an emporium for slaves. To-day Carthage fills but a narrow and obscure space upon the page of history.

Why such a fearful doom for such a fair republic? must be an interesting question to every advocate of republican institutions. In solving the question, the discovery is made at the outset that Carthage fell not through a conflict of state rights. It was not that the administration of the government was not beneficent. But her material prosperity paved the way, through unrestricted indulgence, extravagance, effeminacy, and loss of patriotism, to her overthrow and ruin.

The national simplicity, industry, and frugality, upon which the commonwealth had been founded and which had contributed largely in building it up, gave way with astonishing rapidity to other controlling tendencies and evils. Changes in opinion and fashion appear, during the space of a very few years, to have been completely revolutionized. To be an agriculturist was no longer thought honorable, hence those who were able sought to enter the more glittering fields and paths of traffic and commerce. The military spirit likewise speedily declined, and the hitherto victorious Carthaginian armies lost their citizen soldiers, which is always a national calamity. Her military forces were recruited by Libyan conscripts, slaves, and foreign mercenaries. Wars were allowed to impoverish the national treasury, resulting in what is not uncommon, a nation struggling with bankruptcy, though having individual citizens possessed of immense wealth.

Avarice soon stifled patriotism in the hearts of the rich; the mercenary troops could not be paid; they revolted, and more than once brought Carthage to the brink of ruin. Immense fortunes had been amassed by a few, while the poorer classes became still poorer. The rich fell into luxurious and extravagant ways of living, which the poorer and middle classes attempted to imitate, but of course could not. Jealousies and feuds between leading parties and leading men, such as those between Hanno and Hamilcar Baca, those between capital and labor, between the aristocracy and the democracy, between war and peace parties, became frequent, and were in Carthage, as elsewhere, extremely demoralizing. Infringements and violations of the national constitution followed. Several distinct offices were unconstitutionally combined in one person, who, by force or bribes, could command them, for the masses came to care not for the republic, but thought only of the next dinner. The profligate citizens often broke up into angry and tumultuous factions, and were utterly uncontrollable. The formation of the court of the One Hundred was inevitable, and this, managed by a few bold leaders, became at length a political inquisition, ordering banishment or death as it might dictate. In this way, as might be expected, Carthage, during the space of a few months, lost many of her best citizens. Carthaginian subjects in Africa and in the Punic towns, groaning under the burdens of increased taxation and internal revenues, became rebels. These insurrections the state had no power to suppress.

When, therefore, this internally divided republic, whose citizens were destitute of a self-sacrificing patriotism, could

agree upon no policy, when there was no man daring enough to usurp control of the government and unite the people, then Carthage was attacked by the Romans, and fell. Her fall, however, was not so much through Roman might and prowess as through her own folly.

Destroyed by national prosperity, by extravagant outlays, by political jealousies, and by contending parties, is the epitaph to be written over the grave of the once famous Carthaginian republic. This is but one of many illustrations of the ease with which a mighty people, when divided into contending factions, may be conquered by a foe far inferior.

In a characteristic and brutal manner the Romans completed their conquest of this sister republic. Her stately metropolis, which had been enriched with the gold and the silver, the statues and the pictures of a score of countries, with its towers, its ramparts, its walls, its canals, its ornamental displays, and its public and private parks and edifices of every character, which the industrious Carthaginians had constructed during the course of many ages, and at vast expense, were completely destroyed; not a single house was permitted to stand when the first conquerors entered the city.[14]

This destruction was about 146 B. C. Twenty-four years later, C. Gracchus, then tribune of the Roman people, in order to ingratiate himself with the multitude, undertook to rebuild Carthage, though the Roman Senate had ordered that it should never be inhabited, denouncing fearful imprecations against any one who, contrary to the prohibition, should dare attempt its restoration. Gracchus sent thither a colony of six thousand Roman citizens. But

whatever of the city was restored by Gracchus, was again laid in ashes by Maxentius. Afterwards it was rebuilt by Julius Cæsar, but subsequently taken by Genseric, the Vandal king. Still later it was so utterly demolished by the Mohammedan Saracens that there was scarcely a vestige left, and thus it has remained to the present day.

"This great city, therefore, furnishes the most striking example in the annals of the world of a mighty power, which, having long ruled over subject peoples, taught them the arts of commerce and civilization, and created for them an imperishable name, has left behind it little more than a name." "A state perished, in which Rome lost," as Schmitz says, "what could never be restored to her, a noble rival."

> "Delenda est Carthago! let the tear
> Still drop, deserted Carthage, on thy bier;
> Let mighty nations pause as they survey
> The world's great empires crumbled to decay;
> And, hushing every rising tone of pride,
> Deep in the heart this moral lesson hide,
> Which speaks with hollow voice as from the dead,
> Of beauty faded and of glory fled —
> Delenda est Carthago."

CHAPTER IV.

ROME.

From Greece and Carthage to the Roman republic, which had conquered them both, is a natural transition. Like Greece, Italy had natural barriers against invasions scarcely equalled. A peninsula stretching down into the Mediterranean seven hundred and fifty miles, securely protected on the north by the Alps, was all that could be asked, in those early times, as to physical defence.

The primitive inhabitants of Rome, like the Israelites and early Greeks, were organized into tribes, clans, and families. A succession of Etruscan kings, beginning, perhaps, 600 B. C., next ruled the country; later, regal Rome mastered the entire Latin coast, and was in position to make treaties with the great powers of the world. Under Servius Tullius, the primitive and crude constitution of Rome was modified so as to receive the common people into state councils upon a property qualification. The death of Tullius, B. C. 535, brought to an end the early kingdom of Rome.

During the next two centuries the government was strongly conservative, though upon certain matters there were frequent and bitter conflicts between the senate and

the commonalty. The democrats resolutely pleaded for more power and for a redistribution of property. In 326 B. C., the democracy was triumphant, and the Publilian Law, which entitled every person to vote without regard to the value of his property, was enacted. In 300 B. C., the Ogulnian law passed, and all distinctions between patricians and plebeians, as to holding office, gradually disappeared. It should be borne in mind that Rome, among all her neighbors, at that time stood alone in her struggles to emancipate herself from both kingly and oligarchical domination.

During these years of her formative history, Rome had the well-nigh inestimable advantage of the military spirit and discipline. Her regular army, especially when on the defence, was mighty because constituted of property owners. Even the youth, sons of patrician and equestrian families, were organized into troops whose chief was called "Prince of the Youth." "If you would know why Rome was great," says a diligent student of Roman history, "consider that Roman soldier whose armed skeleton was found in a recess near the gate of Pompeii. When on that guilty little city burst the sulphurous storm, the undaunted hero dropped the visor of his helmet, and stood there to die." [15]

Like Greece and Carthage, Rome, while in her ascendency, retained respect for the arts of agriculture. The plains of Italy were abundant in crops of various kinds, and rich in pastures and flocks. "The main source of wealth among the Romans, and their most honorable occupation," says Schmitz, "was agriculture. The greatest generals and statesmen, after holding for a time the helm

of the republic, and gaining victories and triumphs, did not scruple to return to the plough and live in rural retirement." [16]

Later, the national taste and culture of Rome became such that the world has never hesitated in these matters to acknowledge her superiority. From the death of Sulla to that of Augustus, a period of ninety years, was Rome's golden age in literature. There were minds, in every branch, which only Greece has surpassed. Private and public libraries were established, and there were schools, public and private, whose teachers and professors were taken from the best scholars of all nations. The list of distinguished men is of a character to make any people proud. Pompey and Cæsar, Cicero and Cato, Virgil, Horace, and a list only a little less noted, might be enumerated.

Rome, protected by her natural boundaries, and compact in her population, after making herself mistress of the peninsula of Italy, yielded to natural human instincts of extending her territory, and at length determined the fate of the world.

During the hundred years just preceding the monarchy under Augustus, the political power of the republic was colossal; she held sway over all the islands of the Mediterranean, conquered and ruled Egypt, Cyrene, the African territories of ancient Carthage, Numidia, Mauritania, Spain, Gaul as far as the Rhine, Illyricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia, Mœsia, Macedonia, Thrace, Greece, and nearly the whole immense territories of Asia lying between Mount Caucasus, the Caspian Sea, the Parthian empire, the Persian and Arabian gulfs, and the Mediterranean.

Such were the position, strength, and vast extent of the Roman republic. If permanency and stability can be expected in human governments, Rome might well have been regarded as secure and mighty. During one hundred and twenty years, that is, from 265 to 145 B. C., the constitution of the Roman republic retained its vigor, working, to all appearance, in the highest perfection.

But, notwithstanding all these advantages and these prophecies of continued greatness, that majestic Roman republic is now only a name in history. After the republic came the empire, in which were some of the most cruel despots who have ever disgraced humanity.

After the glory and the shame of the empire came barbarian conquests and spoliations; and after the northern, eastern, and western invasions, came the deplorable sway of the Roman Catholic church.

The question naturally asked by every friend of republican institutions is, Why is not Rome to-day a flourishing republic, something as she was during the time of her ascendency and domination? She had before her the history of the Grecian republics and the history of the Carthaginian republic; historic lessons were studied in her schools and recounted in public assemblies. But Rome wrapped bandages about her eyes and marched into the same dark gulfs, where had sunk her sister republics.

The steps leading from Rome's greatness to her degradation are very easily traced. It will be seen at the outset, however, that the path to her overthrow was not in the direction of disunion. Comparing the Grecian and the Roman republics, the important discovery is made, that, while a disunion of states is perilous, a centralized government,

even the strongest, is not on that account secure against subversion and overthrow. The curse of great, and especially of rapidly accumulated wealth, stands among the first of a series of destructive evils in the Roman commonwealth. Especially after the victories over Macedonia and Antiochus, Rome rapidly extended her commercial relations, and opened the way to immense mercantile fortunes. The success of Roman arms also brought rich prizes to commanders and soldiers.[17] Wealth was no longer, as aforetime, measured by copper, but by silver and gold. The desire and passion for accumulation took possession of all classes. Ancient simplicity in modes of living, as might be expected, gave place to inordinate extravagance. The elegance of the private residences of leading Romans had never been surpassed. A slave, who was a good cook, commanded the highest price in the market.[18] All who could afford to do so indulged fully in the luxuries of Greece and the Orient; those who could not were filled with hatred towards those who could. The love of the theatre was followed by a passion for the more degrading public shows and bloody gladiatorial exhibitions. The avarice of the great, the licentiousness of the populace, and the growing cruelty of all classes, settled like a miasm upon the Roman republic.

Shortly after the victories over Macedonia, the Romans began to look upon agriculture as no longer worthy of rank among honorable occupations; it was consequently abandoned to slaves. In early times there was a law that no man should own more than five hundred acres. But this law became a dead letter, and those who had opportunities for accumulating immense fortunes bought up the estates

of small landed proprietors, using them for pastures, placing them under the cultivation of slaves, cutting them up into parks, or using them for other purely ornamental purposes.[19] At length Italy, one of the most fertile countries of Europe, was dependent for her annual supply of corn upon Sicily, Africa, Sardinia, and Egypt.

Those who were thoughtful and patriotic students of Roman affairs earnestly sought to correct these evils. Tiberius Gracchus did all he could to form an industrious class of agriculturists. "The unemployed in the city on the Seven Hills were bravely and even tenderly remembered by Gracchus, although they contained explosive elements, idle tramps, and refuse, which Shakspeare, by the mouth of Coriolanus, has described as reek of the rotten fens." He pleaded for a redistribution of the public lands, on which he saw slaves in chains performing manual labor. He sought to enforce that ancient law by which no more than five hundred acres of the public land could belong to one person, unless he had sons, in which case two hundred and fifty acres were added for each son.

But in these laudable undertakings Gracchus had but few influential sympathizers; he was far more successful in arousing the bitter resentment of the wealthy than in securing the end he had in view. In his thirty-fifth year, during an election riot in Rome, he was cruelly murdered.

Virgil also attempted an agricultural reform by the means of his pen. He wrote the Bucolics in order to reawaken interest in the cultivation of the soil. But by all his poetic arts he was unable to lift into respectability what the Romans had come to look upon as one of the dishonorable employments.

In close alliance with the evils already mentioned, came also a blight upon the Roman family. Women, even more than men, were infatuated and intoxicated with the social excesses and licentiousness of the times. The care and trouble incident to rearing a family of children became irksome to the higher classes, and as a result the number of free native Roman citizens constantly decreased, while freedmen, slaves, and foreigners multiplied with extraordinary rapidity. And further: the education of the young was no longer under the eyes of parents, but was left to the care of foreign teachers, especially to the Greek *pædagogi*. Says Plutarch: "When Cæsar, upon a certain occasion, happened to see some women at Rome carrying young dogs and monkeys in their arms, and fondly caressing them, he asked whether the women in their country never bore any children, thus reproving with a proper severity those who lavish upon brutes that natural tenderness which is due only to mankind."

Laxity of morals was accompanied by scepticism in religion. In the days of Cicero the people seemed to have lost all reverential feeling, "and treated religious matters either with perfect indifference or else with ridicule." [20]

In her closing days, the republic was infested with hordes of superficial and depraved lawyers. Men read law, not because it was an ennobling study not because they could better serve the commonwealth, but because they could better serve themselves and attain positions otherwise denied The road to political preferment lay through the practice of law. To be a consul, one must be a lawyer. The senate was controlled by lawyers. The patrician would lose caste if he engaged in any business except law.

But are men who enter the legal profession chiefly for political preferment safe rulers and legislators? Ask Rome!

During the early days of the republic, judges, if convicted of taking bribes, were wont to be punished by heavy fines, were disqualified from being senators, and were sometimes sent into exile. But later, the courts and government were so far demoralized that it was a practice of the most common occurrence to buy up with impunity the judges on the bench. An appeal to the courts came to be well-nigh useless, except to those who could purchase decisions.

"The love of money and power deadened every other feeling," says an able historian; "and the judges were not much better than those whose acts of injustice they were called upon to punish."

We notice also, what should always be regarded as a misfortune, the decline of the military spirit among the native citizens. In 107 B. C., Marius set at naught an ancient custom, and enlisted large numbers of the poorer classes, who had never before served in the Roman legions. The nobles did not object, since they were thereby relieved from the necessity of military service. They prized their ease so highly that they could not, or at least did not, see the peril of intrusting military matters to a few designing leaders and to slaves and poor people, who were without patriotism and fiercely greedy for pelf and plunder.

Well may a nation tremble when, in disturbed times, an ambitious military genius comes into power, at the head of *slaves and aliens*. Since the soldiers of Rome served not for patriotism but for pay, and since they were blind to all interests save to those of the commander, it is

not surprising that the Senate came to dread the success of the national armies almost as much as their defeat.[21]

The administration of the general government became even more deplorable and dangerous than that of her courts or her military affairs. Strifes between different classes and parties grew more and more determined. The old patrician aristocracy, gradually reduced in numbers and influence, still clung tenaciously to their distinctions and rank. Some of the plebeian families which had accumulated wealth formed themselves into a new aristocracy, called "upstarts." The feuds between these contending factions were so bitter, that, during their strifes, the safety of the state was by neither party cared for nor thought of. The population of the city, constantly increasing in numbers, but being without property or industry, were in condition to be bought and used by either party or by any person, patriot or traitor, who would pay the largest price.

The "upstarts" were thus enabled to buy the seats of the Senate chamber The Senate was degraded still further by the admission into it of persons from the most disreputable classes. These were admitted to the highest legislative trusts through the influence of corrupt demagogues who desired their votes. Such senators never thought of legislating for the good of the state. They voted with and for those who could best pay, feed, and amuse them. The stern simplicity and strict morality of early times gave place on every hand to intrigue and vile cunning. The mob element of Rome, having been bribed and cajoled by unprincipled political leaders and office-seekers, began to feel that in state matters they were of chief importance. "They looked to the state for a living,

and to ambitious office-seekers for pastimes and amusements." The republic yielded to the demand, fed the idle rabble, at one time to the number of three hundred and twenty thousand.[22] Men who wanted the votes of the populace expended fortunes in games and gladiatorial exhibitions.[23] In consequence, the mob democracy became more and more difficult to manage. The Censors, chiefly to keep the city masses employed, ordered public expeditions, such as the paving of streets, the gravelling of roads, the building of aqueducts and of bridges. But the vast number of persons who had been brought to the city by the conquests of Rome in Africa, Macedonia, Greece, and Spain, and who were now reduced to slavery, rendered their economical employment impossible. And further, when it was known that the city was giving employment, many from the surrounding provinces flocked to Rome, to share in the labor and its remuneration. The embarrassments were thereby increased. The mob grew more and more dangerous and threatening; they became lawless and abusive. The time came when there was no government; the noblest Romans, disgusted with mob dictation and rule, abandoned the republic, or obtained such military commands as would require their presence in distant places.

Rome still had her schools and her literature; Greek philosophy was mastered by a multitude of her citizens; Greek manners were introduced into all respectable households; children were taught in history, poetry, and rhetoric. But, somehow, all this education did not inspire patriotism, reduce crime, nor seemingly benefit the republic. Demagogues, sacrificing everything and everybody

standing in the way of their ambitious designs, had robbed the republic of patriotism. Who could love such a country? The state "became an arena on which the principal men were merely struggling for power and influence." Ancient regulations for preserving the purity of voting lists were neglected. It was impossible to distinguish between those who were entitled to the rights of franchise and those who were not. In such disturbed times all classes are under the delusion that any change will improve civil affairs. It was thus in Rome. The republic had not seen a Dictator for more than a century. But when the victorious general Sulla (82 B.C.) returned from his foreign campaigns, the people were in readiness to proclaim him Dictator. This position he would not have dared to assume but for the feeble and demoralized republican sentiment that opposed him.

His reign did not accomplish what was expected. He mitigated certain evils, but occasioned new ones. In order to place himself beyond danger, he confiscated the possessions of the few who would not yield, and made them over to his soldiers. The Roman franchise was also conferred upon a body of ten thousand emancipated slaves, and vacancies in the Senate were filled by Equites and Centurions, who for the most part, being merely the ignorant and willing tools of Sulla, were utterly unfit for the position. He thus formed an oligarchy of a new class of citizens, after extirpating, by murder and proscription, the old ones. During his short reign, merely to acquire means to satisfy his reckless and greedy soldiers, he must be held responsible for the murder of eight thousand Samnite captives, forty-six consulars, prætors, and ædiles, two hundred sen-

ators, sixteen hundred equites, and one hundred and fifty thousand citizens. Besides these crimes, he drove thousands of the most industrious and peaceable people into exile, poverty, and wretchedness.

Sulla, by his tyrannical power, smothered elements which had threatened general conflagration; still, these suppressed dangers and evils awaited only a favorable opportunity to break forth anew.

Following the death of Sulla, while Roman arms were everywhere victorious, Rome and Italy grew worse and worse. Men like Catiline could be found who were ready to reduce the city to ashes and to murder every leading citizen. There were profligates of all classes, the dregs of humanity, who were longing for a revival of the proscriptions under the reign of Sulla. Demagogism bore its ripest and most loathsome fruit. Pompey, to secure the favor of the populace, enrolled himself as a simple Eques, and paraded himself as such, leading his horse in the procession. He constantly sought, in the measures enacted, to secure his own popularity, though the measures might be utterly damaging to the national welfare. His competitor, Crassus, who could command greater wealth, sought, by distributing large quantities of corn among the people, and by feasting them at thousands of public tables, to outbid Pompey.

These instances are mentioned as examples of what was constantly taking place. It was generally acknowledged that no one could obtain office without expending money or property to bribe the electors. And yet the time had been in the history of the republic when canvassing for votes by corrupt means, or even by personal solicitation,

was heavily fined, and the person convicted was excluded from the Senate, and was perpetually incapacitated from holding public office. In the later and degenerate days, however, office-holders not only bought up the popular vote, but, in order to provide themselves with funds necessary to command votes for their re-election, freely embezzled public moneys and practised all sorts of extortions upon conquered provinces.[24]

The time had been when a public libeller might be beaten to death, and, even if the castigation did not result fatally, he was looked upon as civilly dead, and could neither give evidence in court nor make a will. But in those later days of the republic, each candidate for office sought, by calumnies and misrepresentations, to blacken the reputation of his competitor, and thus the fickle populace was made to look upon even the best friends of the republic with suspicion and distrust. At length these controversies were so heated, and the jealousies so bitter, that there seemed no safety for either the citizen or the state.

There were likewise other grounds of insecurity. From the time when Sulla had allied himself with the murderous Catiline, in order to defeat his aged rival C. Marius, there had been coalitions of singular and startling character. Corrupt and daring men were constantly in league, not chiefly, and in most instances not at all, for the public good, but to defeat opponents, to secure personal safety or aggrandizement. Marius entered into league with the bold and cunning tribune P. Sulpicius, who, in defiance of constitutional authority, dared to organize a body of three thousand gladiators, whom he termed his anti-senate. Other famous alliances were those between M. Æmilius

Lepidus and Q. Lutatius Catulus, Brutus and Pompey, Claudius and Milo, Pompey and Cæsar, Antony and Cornelius. Two or three of these designing and able men, by patronizing the unemployed classes, — the husbandmen who had been reduced to beggary, the military desperados who thronged the country, the exiled citizens, and the hungry populace, — could easily organize an army and wield it solely for selfish purposes. The few noble-minded men "who came forward to put their hands to the wheel," fell victims to their own patriotic efforts, and were crushed under the vice and tyranny of the hour.

In 60 B. C., eighteen years after the death of Sulla, Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus, by uniting their strength, found it an easy matter to seize and hold in their hands the fate of the republic. Crassus wanted wealth, Pompey wanted to rule Asia, and Cæsar wanted to rise above them both.

Within seven years affairs grew so turbulent that Pompey was made sole consul, an appointment the first of its kind in the history of Rome. At the death of Crassus, all authority passed into the hands of Pompey and Cæsar. Still the mass of the people did not remonstrate; the republic had sunk so low that one or two strong men must head affairs; it might as well be Pompey and Cæsar as any other two or three whom the citizens could name.

But more than this. The state was in such condition, and the ancient reverence for the constitution had so far diminished, that it could be violated with the utmost impunity. The repeated election of Marius to consulship; the investment of Pompey with supreme command over all parts and coasts of the Mediterranean, a power subsequently extended over Bithynia, Pontus, and Armenia; the

extension of time in the ruling of provinces; the domination of the tribunes, and the putting to death of Roman citizens without trial, — were a few of the many constitutional infringements which, with scarcely a popular protest, were enacted by the leading men of the republic.

These repeated transgressions of the constitution, and this unsettled condition of public affairs, filled Cæsar with daring sufficient to cross the Rubicon without asking permission of the Senate. That bold and law-defying step was to settle the question whether Rome was master of herself or subject to Cæsar "On the ever-memorable night," says De Quincey, "when he had resolved to take the first step (and in such a case the first step, as regarded the power of retreating, was also the final step) which placed him in arms against the state, it happened that his head-quarters were at some distance from the little river Rubicon, which formed the boundary of his province. With his usual caution, that no news of his motions might run before himself, on this night Cæsar gave an entertainment to his friends, in the midst of which he slipped away unobserved, and with a small retinue proceeded through the woods to the point of the river at which he designed to cross. The night was stormy, and by the violence of the wind all the torches of his escort were blown out, so that the whole party lost their road, having probably at first intentionally deviated from the main route, and wandered about through the whole night, until the early dawn enabled them to recover their true course. The light was still gray and uncertain, as Cæsar and his retinue rode down upon the banks of the fatal river — to cross which with arms in his hands, since the further bank lay within the

territory of the republic, *ipso facto*, proclaimed any Roman a rebel and a traitor. No man, the firmest or the most obtuse, could be otherwise than deeply agitated, when looking down upon this little brook, so insignificant in itself, but invested by law with a sanctity so awful, and so dire a consecration. The whole course of future history, and the fate of every nation, would necessarily be determined by the irretrievable act of the next half hour.

"In these moments, and with this spectacle before him, and contemplating these immeasurable consequences consciously for the last time that could allow him a retreat, — impressed also by the solemnity and deep tranquillity of the silent dawn, whilst the exhaustion of his night wanderings predisposed him to nervous irritation, — Cæsar, we may be sure, was profoundly agitated. The whole elements of the scene were almost scenically disposed; the law of antagonism having perhaps never been employed with so much effect: the little quiet brook presenting a direct antithesis to its grand political character; and the innocent dawn, with its pure, untroubled repose, contrasting potently, to a man of any intellectual sensibility, with the long chaos of bloodshed, darkness, and anarchy which was to take its rise from the apparently trifling acts of this one morning. So prepared, we need not much wonder at what followed. Cæsar was yet lingering on the hither bank, when suddenly, at a point not far distant from himself, an apparition was descried in a sitting posture, and holding in its hand what seemed a flute. This phantom was of unusual size, and of beauty more than human, so far as its lineaments could be traced in the early dawn. What is singular, however, in the story, on any hypothesis which

would explain it out of Cæsar's individual condition, is, that others saw it as well as he; both pastoral laborers, (who were present, probably in the character of guides,) and some of the sentinels stationed at the passage of the river. These men fancied even that a strain of music issued from this aerial flute. And some, both of the shepherds and the Roman soldiers, who were bolder than the rest, advanced towards the figure. Amongst this party, it happened that there were a few Roman trumpeters. From one of these, the phantom, rising as they advanced nearer, suddenly caught a trumpet, and blowing through it a blast of superhuman strength, plunged into the Rubicon, passed to the other bank, and disappeared in the dusky twilight of the dawn. Upon which Cæsar exclaimed: 'It is finished — the die is cast — let us follow whither the guiding portents from heaven, and the malice of our enemy, alike summon us to go.' So saying, he crossed the river with impetuosity; and, in a sudden rapture of passionate and vindictive ambition, placed himself and his retinue upon the Italian soil; and, as if by inspiration from Heaven, in one moment involved himself and his followers in treason, raised the standard of revolt, put his foot upon the neck of the invincible republic which had humbled all the kings of the earth, and founded an empire which was to last for a thousand and half a thousand years. In what manner this spectral appearance was managed — whether Cæsar were its author, or its dupe — will remain unknown forever. But undoubtedly this was the first time that the advanced guard of a victorious army was headed by an apparition; and we may conjecture that it will be the last."

After taking this bold step, it was comparatively an easy

matter for Cæsar to dare other political transgressions. He broke open the national treasury, took for personal and campaign purposes the public money, and caused himself to be nominated Dictator by Lepidus, a prætor. These were clearly illegal acts.[25] But when nearly all public acts were both illegal and unjust, who could well object to what Cæsar had done?[26] Assuming the position of Dictator, the senate and people at once meekly bowed to the will of this great leader and usurper. To make himself secure against political opponents, Cæsar confiscated and sold the property of Pompey, and, by arbitrary will, introduced many personal friends and partisans into the Senate. This packed senate received Cæsar, after his Spanish victories, with the most abject flattery and servility. He was pronounced "the father of his country." He was sovereign and usurper of the republic — more properly, sovereign and usurper of a *wrecked* republic.

When, therefore, Rome had become little better than a den of robbers and vagabonds; when extravagance and luxury had reached their height in such families as had the means of indulgence; when audacity and impudence were rampant among the rabble because law was powerless to check them; when good men, whose number grew smaller and smaller, had everything to fear, while bad men felt that, whatever the changes impending, their condition could only be improved; — when affairs had come to this desperate pass, then the Roman republic existed only in name. The strifes between conflicting political parties; the arrogance and corruptions of wealth; the distress of poverty; the hired assassin, the blood-stained streets and halls, led the law-abiding citizens of all classes, even the

most patriotic, — men of letters, like Horace, those who had done all in their power to save the republic, — to cry out for a king, or for a military despot, for any usurper who could maintain order and who would promise to restore prosperity to the suffering commonwealth. Usurpation in such an hour is not a crime; it is, upon the ground of a greater good to a greater number, positively demanded of one who has ability or power to bring order out of confusion. It was no longer a question whether the Roman republic should continue; the question was, rather, who, upon its ruins, shall establish the Roman empire? If none were fitter, who could object to Cæsar?

The conspiracy of Brutus and Cassius, which resulted in the murder of Cæsar, shows that there were a few who would not submit gracefully. They revolted, however, not through patriotism, but because they were ambitious for the place held by Cæsar. All things considered, the death of Cæsar must be looked upon as a loss to the Roman people. They needed a ruler; they were not likely to find one superior to the assassinated dictator.

After the murder of Cæsar, Octavianus, his nephew, afterwards emperor Augustus, who had been adopted as the successor of the childless Cæsar, allied himself with two other men, Antony and Lepidus, to rule the empire. They first gained over the soldiers by promising to distribute lands among them; they next rid themselves of enemies by the terrible process of proscription. The names of persons whom they disliked were written upon a list which was publicly posted. Any man was at liberty to kill the proscribed, and in many cases large rewards were offered the assassins. Men were proscribed whose only offence was

that they had been friendly to some opponent, or that they were rich. Death was threatened also to any person who should dare conceal or aid a proscribed citizen. The scenes of inhuman cruelty enacted in Rome at that period were not less brutal than the horrors in France during the days of Robespierre, Danton, and Marat. Two thousand Equites and three hundred senators were massacred during a few days, while hundreds of the best citizens fled for protection to Sicily and to other places more distant. The remaining steps which carried the republic completely under the imperial sway of Augustus were quickly taken. One of these triumvirs, Lepidus, was defeated, leaving the affairs of the empire in the hands of Octavianus and Antony. Misfortunes came upon Antony, while Octavianus was everywhere successful.

In the year 29 B. C. Octavianus returned to Rome to celebrate the national victories. He was greeted by the people with the greatest enthusiasm, and the senate conferred upon him the title of *Imperator* for life. The Roman republic, dead for years, was now buried, and the people were *glad*. They hailed with delight the end of feuds and the establishment of a monarchy.[27]

Here in Italy were the same inspiring scenery, the same rich fields, the same climate, essentially the same blood; but a degenerate and demoralized people had become such that they could no longer live safely except under the strong hand of a monarch. Here, therefore, is an illustration of what has more than once appeared in history, namely, a form of government well adapted to one age being but poorly adapted to another. Therefore a given form of government which should be fought for under one class

of circumstances, should not, under a different class, be defended by the drawing of a single sword.

The new emperor Augustus reigned forty-three years (B. C. 29—A. D. 14). He restored the blessings of peace. Rome, the den of robbers, was renovated and rendered safe to dwell in. The people, for the most part, seemed to have forgotten their past political freedom, losing all interest in political matters. The monarch, without popular remonstrance, gradually assumed the different powers of the state in his own person. He excluded the "upstart" from the senate, limited the number of senators, then limited their meetings, and lastly, in the administration of public affairs, ignored the body almost entirely. He had no ministers of state, but sought the advice of personal friends of acknowledged ability. Yet so beneficent was the government that all praised it, and the power of Augustus was as safe as if, instead of being a usurper, as he really was, he had been born to the throne of the Roman empire.

This appears well for Italy and Rome at that time and under that emperor; but let republicans in all existing republics, who are sighing for a monarchy, reflect and remember, that after Augustus came the bloody tyrant, Tiberius, and later, the impious and cruel Caligula, then Nero, at the mention of whose name the world shudders. Afterwards came Domitian, whose impiousness equalled that of Caligula and whose cruelty was like that of Nero.

After the emperors followed the period of invasions. Alaric, the Visigoth, sacked Rome; Attila destroyed other cities of Italy, and Odoacer brought the empire completely to an end. Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, established a monarchy which was overthrown by Belisarius and Nar-

setes. Afterwards the Lombards obtained mastery, but their kingdom was overthrown by Charlemagne, and the laws of the state gave way to the laws of the Romish church. And then that country which had been a republic — in some respects the greatest republic of the world — was ruled by one mind, "that of a single pope, and by one sword, that of a single emperor."

II.

EXTINCT REPUBLICS; MEDIEVAL AND MODERN DATE.

CHAPTER I.

I. LOMBARD COMMUNES. II. GENOA. III. VENICE.

In the north of Italy, upon the territory extending from the Alps to the Po, and from Lago Maggiore and the Ticino to Lago di Garda and the Mincio, are several cities which in the eleventh century achieved their independence. Between these cities there was no firm federal compact, though in times of danger they sometimes formed powerful leagues. In union they were enabled to defeat Frederic Barbarossa, in 1176, and Frederic II. in 1225. Following the Peace of Constance (1183), they rapidly increased in wealth, power, and influence. They were the centres of a remarkable revival in commerce, art, and learning. Italy seemed again the home of freedom and of civil and political prosperity. But to-day all these republics, except San Marino, on Monte Titanus, are merely historic. Their story is briefly told. In 1220 civil contentions between the nobles and the commons assumed a threatening character. In Milan, Piacenza, Modena, Cremona, and Bologna, there was resort to arms. The disputes were based chiefly upon the question of a form of government — whether it should be purely democratic or oligarchic. Occasionally the rival parties would patch up a hollow peace, which was sure to be followed by a renewal of hostilities.

At length social and political quiet gave place entirely to altercation, wrangling, and political proscription. "Exiles were plotting without," says the historian, "and traitors within. The forms of a free constitution were maintained, but they were empty forms. The magistrates, who were nominally endowed with judicial and executive authority, were the mere puppets of the party chieftains who had called them into public life. A government of faction was substituted for a government of law." Citizens were proscribed by each dominant party, their houses sacked and fired, and their property confiscated. Almost every stone of those medieval palaces which had withstood the ravages of so many wars could "tell a tale of frightful tragedies, and of the play of ungovernable passions, of seditions, revolutions, and riots, which surged around their base and beat against their gloomy gigantic walls."

Civil dissensions in the Communes, as in other historic states, had weakened and then demoralized the citizenship. The people, being in perpetual danger, lost their love of country. Usurpers and invaders easily assumed the reins of government. Padua fell under the power of Eccelino; Treviso surrendered to imperial arms; Vicenza, Brescia, and Faenza, were taken by assault; Milan yielded to an imperial form of government, and Bologna quietly submitted to the Visconti. The Visconti gradually extended their conquests until all northern Italy, except the Venetian dogado, surrendered to their domination.

Florence remained longest the champion of constitutional liberty. She had a famous history, and at the dawn of the Christian era was one of the most flourishing cities of Europe. Her prosperity and triumphs during the twelfth

century were magnificent. But later, that republic, whose armies were successful abroad, whose territories were constantly extending, and whose financial credit was unchallenged, found herself embroiled in civil disturbances and feuds that threatened her existence. She could still increase in wealth; she could command an army of her own citizenship of above seventy thousand; her merchants had almost unlimited credit throughout the civilized world; she cultivated letters, had famous schools and encouraged the arts, but was not capable of self-government. "The city," says Machiavelli, "was well able to hold its own against all the states of Italy by its own strength. That mischief, however, which no power from without could have accomplished, was worked by those within the gates."

The contending factions grew more and more fierce, vindictive, and unrelenting. The oligarchical party was first successful, and expelled those who favored democratic supremacy. Next the democracy was successful, and drove the advocates of oligarchy into exile. The battle of Montaperti (1260) gave the mastery of Florence again to the aristocrats, who, after the defeat of Manfred of Naples, were in turn overthrown by the democracy. Subsequently a third party, composed of tradesmen, became dominant. They excluded both the nobility and the commonalty from participation in the government. The people found, however, that the rule of the so-called Citizen party was as arrogant and tyrannical, after a little time, as had been that of the nobility. Courts of justice were demoralized. Money was lavishly expended with no adequate returns. Assassinations were frequent. The "Ordinances of Justice" were passed, which, for severity and injustice

against the hitherto ruling classes, have no equal in history. New factions appeared at the commencement of the fourteenth century, known as the *Whites* and the *Blacks*. Later, murder was so common that Florence was in the way of entirely losing her citizenship, and, therefore, in order to restore peace to the embroiled and blood-stained city, asked for foreign intervention. In 1343, De Brienne, an unscrupulous despot, seized the reins of government. Next followed the democratic Board of Magistrates of the Guelph party, which proved to be not less tyrannical than the Nobility, the Citizen party, or the despot De Brienne.

"So great was the dread and terror which had fallen on the citizens," says Ammirato, "that no tyrant immediately after the discovery of a conspiracy, was so formidable to his subjects as the magistracy of the Guelph party had become to its fellow-citizens. Wherever they passed in the city the people might be seen to rise from their seats and bow and cringe before them, just as is practised before absolute sovereigns and despots by their subjects. To speak ill of any member of that board of magistrates was a far more dangerous thing than to blaspheme the holy name of God and his saints. The citizens sought to make alliance by marriage with them, even though such alliances might be otherwise most disadvantageous. The shopkeepers readily gave them their goods on credit, and then did not dare to ask for payment for them. And to this end they had people adapted to the working of their tyranny, whose business it was to run up and down the city, and threaten prosecutions or promise favors according to the requirements of the case in hand."

In 1378 there was a general revolt, the government was

overthrown, and the lowest elements in society came to the surface. The mob gave to Michele di Lando, a wool-comber, absolute control of the city, and declared him Lord of Florence. But subsequently, because he would not sanction all their unjust and merciless demands, the mob turned against him and undertook, in a public square, to enact regulations to suit their revolutionary purposes.

It is dangerous for a democratic mob to get the taste of power; it is like letting a hungry tiger lick blood. This mob passed the most exacting and communistic laws imaginable. Respectable citizens were terror-struck. Their only safety consisted in standing aloof and in surrendering public affairs entirely into the hands of the revolutionists.

Fortunately for the safety of the state, the Medici soon overthrew this rude republic and seized the government.[28] By weeding out their enemies, through the adoption, when necessary, of harsh and even cruel measures, they ruled Florence as autocrats, but, under the circumstances, ruled it well. Pietro Medici was expelled (1498), and Savonarola established a kind of democratic theocracy, but was shortly after crucified as a heretic by Pope Alexander. The commonwealth subsequently passed through a varying fortune until the reconciliation of Pope Clement to the Emperor Charles. It was thereupon agreed that Florence should become a dukedom. The Florentines made a brief though gallant struggle to maintain their liberties; but the day had passed. Unfortunately Florence had no citizen soldiery.[29] Her conquests abroad were not through Florentine valor, but by mercenary troops. The nobility and tradesmen had come to look with contempt upon the military

profession. The rich plebeian was busy in his storehouse, devoted to money-getting and luxury; enter the ranks he would not while money could hire a substitute. But a mercenary soldiery can never take the place of a nation's militia. Thus Florence was helpless; when the Pope and the emperor so determined, the commonwealth became a dukedom, with Alessandro de Medici for its ruler. Alessandro was killed in 1539, and was succeeded by his son. After the death of this last duke of the Medicean family, the government of Tuscany, with Florence, its capital, fell to Francis, Duke of Lorraine, later, Emperor of Germany. His descendants were expelled by the French in 1799. In 1801 Tuscany, under Louis of Parma, became a part of the kingdom of Etruria. In 1808 it was ruled by France. In 1814 the Grand-duke Ferdinand III. acquired possession; but in 1859 his son, Ferdinand IV., abdicated, and in May 22, 1860, Tuscany was incorporated into the kingdom of Italy, and Florence was the capital of the kingdom until 1871, when this dignity was conferred upon Rome.

II. Genoa. — In a small bay of the Gulf of Genoa, at the foot of the Ligurian Apennines, is a city which has experienced more political revolutions, perhaps, than any other in Europe. At the beginning of the second Punic war (218 B. C.) it is mentioned by Livy as a town having friendly relations with Rome. During the sixth century it fell into the hands of the Lombards, and later passed under the sway of Charlemagne. During the tenth century, Genoa freed herself from the Frank counts imposed by Charlemagne, and established a free constitution. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the republic rapidly in-

creased in power and wealth. The Genoese merchants, termed "the superb merchant-princes," were formidable upon all seas; they supplied the markets of Constantinople, conquered the right to trade on the shores of the Caspian, dealt largely in the costly merchandise of India, and pushed their commerce far into other parts of Asia. The conquests of the republic, considering its size, are certainly remarkable. City after city fell under her sway — Corsica, Minorca Capraja, Almeria, Tartosa, Marseilles, Nice, Pisa, and Venice after the battle of Curzola. She made settlements along the coast of the Holy Land; studded the shores of the Euxine with a chain of forts, factories, and colonies, and in 1240 became dictator of the throne of Constantinople. Except for internal dissensions, it is difficult to tell where her conquests would have ended.

The Genoese during their ascendency were bold, energetic, shrewd, frugal, and industrious. The city meanwhile grew in opulence and splendor, receiving the title "La Superba." When viewed from the sea, Genoa had the appearance of a compact mass, resembling an immense marble amphitheatre.

The constitution of the state at the start leaned towards an aristocracy. Then followed that bane of republics — the bitter antagonisms between conservatism and democracy. The democracy gradually came into power, and the state was in tumult. The rule of the podesta succeeded, lasting, with some interruptions, from 1190 to 1270. Spinola and Dona, two distinguished citizens, calling themselves "captains of liberty," next usurped the government, holding it until 1291. They were followed by the "foreign captains;" they in turn by the Council of Twenty-Four,

the members of which were taken equally from the nobles and plebeians. These changes of government resulted in bitter feuds, political corruptions and persecutions. The democracy, when in power, were far more relentless and cruel than the conservatives. So fearful were these hostilities that the city with its outlying territory was left almost desolate. Tired of discord, ready for any change of government which might render property and person safe, the mass of the citizens, in a convention in 1339, elected for life a magistrate, termed a doge, and excluded by law all the nobles from ever filling that office. Two centuries later, under the leadership of Andrew Doria, a more liberal policy was adopted. But persecutions, conspiracies, an unsettled government, protracted wars with Pisa and Venice, and the plague of 1656, had so weakened the power of Genoa that she first yielded to Austria, then to Bonaparte. He gave her the title of Ligurian Republic. But in 1802 Bonaparte united both city and province to the empire of France. By the congress of Vienna, Genoa became, and remains, a tributary city of the Sardinian monarchy.

III. VENICE. — Upon the shores of the Adriatic, between the mouth of the Piane on the north, and the Adige on the south, is a group of fifteen small islands, formed by alluvial deposits, which were originally marshy, and uninhabited except by a few fishermen. In 452 A. D., Attila with his horde of Huns swept over northern Italy, leaving city and town ruined and desolate. A few families of culture and wealth sought upon these bleak and barren islands a refuge from the Hun devastations. They commenced in the humblest way, but laid the foundation "of proud

and powerful Venice." In the middle of the sixth century Venice had an independent government, her rulers being called "maritime tribunes." In 697 the Venetians, owing to increasing and threatening rivalries between the different islands, wisely formed a federal union, and chose a chief magistrate, called *Doge*. Until 755 the authority of the doge was well-nigh imperial. At the usurpation of Domenigo Osseolo (1033) the people were thoroughly aroused, democratic sentiments prevailed, and the national assembly abolished hereditary succession. Venice meanwhile was growing immensely rich and influential; she was queen of Mediterranean commerce, and ruled over extensive colonial domains. The Venetians have been called, with strict justice, the Tyrians of the Middle Ages. Towards the close of the fourteenth century Venetian argosies were upon every sea; her merchandise crowded every port and was carried far into Inner Asia. Her schools were celebrated, her art renowned, and she was accomplished in all the refinements of the age. In military achievements she was equally conspicuous. Padua, Verona, Vicenza, Barsano, Belluno, Brescia, Bergamo, Crema, Cremona, Rovigo, and Treviso, one after another, yielded to her dominion. During the season of her greatest prosperity, wealth and aristocracy, for the most part, administered her public affairs, led her armies, and commanded her navies. Some of the Venetian families became famous throughout the civilized world. "The common people," says the historian, "were busy at their trades and their traffic, and were content to leave the honors and emoluments of office to those whom God and nature seemed to have marked as their masters. The lower class had plenty to do and nothing to fear; their

lives and their rights were protected, and they enjoyed the guardian care of a stable government — a rare privilege in those stormy, tumultuous times. Universal suffrage still existed. Although the population had increased to about sixty-five thousand, the national assembly was yet the great legislature of the republic. At fixed periods the three estates of the commonwealth, the Upper, Middle, and Lower, were convoked in the church of St. Mark in the capital, or of St. Peter at Castello, to deliberate upon public affairs, and in the national assembly the plebeian was the equal of the proudest patrician."

But soon after the so-termed popular triumphs of 1033, the strife between the aristocracy and the commonalty became determined and bitter. The democracy, not satisfied with what had been gained and enjoyed, clamored at every step for more. The nobility, on the other hand, were constantly plotting against the democracy and seeking in various ways to restrict popular representation and appropriate to themselves even ducal prerogatives. During nearly a hundred years the republic was worried with these political turmoils. The panic following the murder of the Doge Vitali Michieli II. (1172) witnessed a decided gain for the nobility. The government became essentially a patrician oligarchy with constantly increasing power. The doge, though elected by popular vote, was trammelled until he became a "helpless puppet in the hands of the nobility." The government was vested in the Great Council, which was exclusive and thoroughly aristocratic. In 1298 the Great Council, while "packed," abolished, by a decisive vote, popular elections. This was going too far with a people who had enjoyed something of civil rights. These

measures met with a fierce resistance, resulting in a reign of terror, the death-struggle between the two contending parties. To maintain their authority, the nobility first ordered the murder or banishment of the leading malcontents, and then still further centralized the administration of affairs. The Great Council yielded in legislative and executive power to the "Council of Fifteen." In 1310 a "Committee of Ten" was instituted. In 1454 a select "Committee of Three," called "Inquisitors of State," was ordered. The tyranny of the Inquisitors of State was appalling. Patricians and noblemen were arrested, thrown into the *wells* and the *leads*, were strangled or drowned.[30] In 1555 Roman Catholicism was in the politics of Venice, as in other Italian republics, a disturbing factor. The Inquisition, thenceforth religious as well as political, became, as was said, "a rod full of eyes."

Expensive wars with sister republics, the tumults of an unscrupulous democracy, the selfish legislation of a proud oligarchy whose measures were carried out by means of political and religious inquisitions, had been for years slowly but surely undermining patriotism in the hearts of the Venetians. Through increase of wealth, indulgence in idle and extravagant pleasures, and lack of patriotism, the military spirit of the nobility so far declined that it was no longer regarded an honorable occupation to bear arms. The commoners, including the business men, the mechanics, and the artisans, — the best citizens left, — had suffered so much from the arrogant and exclusive government of the oligarchy, that they had not sufficient patriotism left to enlist or fight for the republic. Indeed, these classes were seditious. "The most dangerous enemy is inside our

walls," said the councillors to the doge upon the very day of her overthrow. This destitution of a citizen soldiery brought the republic into a critical and powerless position whenever threatened by foreign foes. The mercenary troops employed for her defence were ignorant of Venetian laws and language, and could be very easily seduced into infidelity to the state. Such an army is a continuous and exhaustive drain upon the public treasury, while it affords but the feeblest protection to the national domains. In 1645 Venice lost so heavily in war that the oligarchy proposed to receive wealthy commoners into the Great Council upon the payment of sixty thousand ducats. Two hundred and sixty-four years prior to this (1381), thirty plebeians were elected nobles as a reward of their bravery and patriotism. Now these honors were bought and sold like common merchandise. Angelo Michieli, an eminent senator, protested. "You change," he exclaimed, "the very nature of this government, in placing the patriciate at auction. Is it to cure an evil that you corrupt the body politic? How can you expect that the people will respect authority in the hands of those whom but recently they had for companions of their labors — perhaps of their vices? You need money! Then sell your sons, but do not sell the nobility." His protests were unavailing. The republic was dead.

By this sale of political and national honors the commonalty who were not rich enough to purchase position were angered, then emboldened, and at length dared assert their political rights. The oligarchy, conscious of its weakness, yielded entirely to the popular will at the election of 1674. There was a varying fortune for the republic during the

next hundred years. In 1797 Napoleon Bonaparte threatened, and Venice, the oldest republic of the world — having from first to last maintained her national credit and her commercial supremacy, and having in former times repulsed Pepin, humbled Barbarossa, and held out against combined Europe — submitted without a struggle, and almost without a protest.

The remainder of the story of Venice is briefly told. From the treaty of Campo Formio (1797) to 1848 was a succession of secret conspiracies or open attempts at rebellion against Austrian domination. In 1848 a revolution broke out which was successful for a time, but in spite of heroic efforts the city fell again into the hands of her northern lord. In 1866, as a consequence of the Austro-Prussian war, Venice and the Venetian provinces became a part of the united kingdom of Italy, "and in the autumn of that year the city welcomed her new sovereign with magnificent demonstrations of joy."[31]

IV. Amalfi. — In passing from northern to southern Italy will be found a city situated seven miles west of Salermo, and thirty south of Naples, bearing the name Amalfi. In the ninth century it contained fifty thousand inhabitants, and later was the capital of a flourishing republic. Gibbon is, perhaps, extravagant in his estimates when stating that Amalfi preceded Venice in reopening intercourse with the Levant. Still, all historians agree that at a very early date she entered upon a maritime career with singular energy and success, and that her mariners excelled in the theory and practice of navigation and astronomy. Her merchants traded extensively with Africa, Arabia, and the

East; her settlements in Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria acquired the privileges of independent colonies. The description of Amalfi by William, the Apulian, is frequently quoted by historians:

> "Nulla magis locuples argento, vestibus, auro
> Partibus innumeris: hac plurimus urbe moratur.
> Nauta *maris cœlique vias aperire peritus.*
> Huc et Alexandri diversa feruntur ab urbe
> Regis, et Antiochi. Gens haec freta plurima transit.
> His Arabes, Indi, Siculi nascuntur et Afri.
> Haec gens est totum prope nobilitata per orbem,
> Et mercando ferens, et amans mercata referre."

After three hundred years of prosperity, Amalfi was oppressed by the arms of the Normans, and subsequently sacked by the jealousy of Pisa. The remains of an arsenal, a cathedral, and the dilapidated palaces of her once royal merchants are now the homes of fishermen "in a very poor line of life."

V. Free Cities of Germany. — During the ascendency and decline of both the Roman republic and the Roman empire, northern Asia, also Europe on the north of Asia, were inhabited by a rough and warlike people called Barbarians, or Scythians. Coming in contact with the civilization of the countries under Roman sway, they saw its advantages, and at length, through its influence, greatly improved upon their savage mode of life. After the wreck of the Roman empire, these Barbarians gradually organized themselves anew under the sway of feudalism. Centres of manufacturing interests, trade, and commerce sprang up and grew rapidly, forming towns and cities. The exactions of the feudal lords, as the towns increased

in wealth and strength, were resisted; the insurrections that followed led to the affranchisement of the larger towns and communities. From the beginning of the twelfth century commercial intercourse sprang up rapidly between these freed cities and many countries of Europe and Asia. But owing to the plundering and piratical character of the age, scarcely a merchant train or ship was safe. Swarms of pirates closely watched the straits of the Baltic and the mouths of the Rhine, the Elbe, and the Save. To protect their commerce against lawless marauders, these northern cities formed what is known as the Hanseatic League, so called from the old Teuton word, *hansa*, meaning an association or company. It is difficult to fix a definite date for the commencement of this confederacy; it was a growth. There are traces of joint defensive action as early as the middle of the twelfth century. A formal treaty was published in 1241. City after city joined the union, until it embraced eighty-five, and in power matched the strongest governments of Europe. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries this confederacy reached its highest degree of power and splendor. The people enjoyed conveniences entirely unknown to their ancestors, whom Rome had never conquered nor for centuries impressed with her civilization. The Hanse confederation deserves a very high rank among the benefactors of mankind. These people resemble in many respects the Phœnicians of much earlier date. They encouraged and cultivated literature, science, and various forms of art. As but few people before them had done, they stimulated production, especially in the four great departments — agriculture, fisheries, mines, and manufactures.

This League "did much to define general principles of

mercantile law, and to enlarge the scope and ennoble the spirit of commercial enterprise, by uniting many petty, narrow interests in a great common cause. It served greatly to increase the wealth of the cities themselves, and to develop in their populations taste, refinement, and genius for both the practical and the fine arts. By the stimulus which it imparted to agricultural industry it also waked a spirit of enterprise and a love of liberty in the breasts of the oppressed tillers of the soil, and thus joined with other influences to prepare the way for the emancipation of the serfs. The League thus touched the springs of social life and activity universally, to the advantage of all classes. In its leading ideas and policy, though crude and only partially developed, we find the germs of that law of reciprocity and freedom which is now so generally recognized as the basis of modern commerce." [32]

The supreme authority of the League was vested in the deputies of the different towns assembled in congress. In it they discussed civil measures, decided upon the sum that each city should contribute to the common fund, and determined such other questions as related to their common interests. The meeting of congress was most frequently held at Lubeck, which was essentially the capital of the League; but sometimes congresses were held at Hamburg, Cologne, and other towns. They met once every three years; oftener if occasion required. Any one might be chosen for a deputy; and besides merchants, the congress comprised clergymen, lawyers, artists, and artisans. When the deliberations were concluded, the decrees were formally communicated to the magistrates of the several cities;

and the most vigorous measures were in early times adopted for carrying those decrees into effect.

We find in the Hanse confederacy much else which challenges our admiration. It maintained its existence for nearly four hundred years. It exercised the same dominion over the Baltic that Venice did over the Adriatic. It secured control of almost the whole foreign commerce of Scandinavia, Denmark, Prussia, Poland, and Russia.

The kings of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway frequently engaged in war with these Hansards, but were always worsted. In 1474 the republic declared war against England, and Edward IV., to secure peace, was glad to concede whatever privileges they demanded. But after having achieved these grand successes and triumphs, the Hansa declined almost as rapidly as it had first arisen.

The fundamental cause of this decline is apparent to every student of history — the government lacked constitutional centralization. The federal union was to them a mere matter of convenience. There was no legal bond that held them together, or that could punish secession or regard it as treason. When, therefore, these cities felt it to be for their interest to withdraw from the confederacy, they did so. Troubles which arose with England in 1597 led to the expenditure of large sums of money, and the Hanse towns were heavily taxed. This led to dissatisfaction, and the maritime cities of the Baltic broke the federal compact and withdrew. Other cities soon lost all interest in the union. In 1630 the last general assembly was summoned at Lübeck, but the deputies from the remaining towns came only to notify their withdrawal. Shortly after this the cities of Hamburg, Lübeck, and Bremen formed a

new association called the Free Hanse Towns. Frankfort-on-the-Main was subsequently added. The four were recognized as the free cities of Germany, each exercising independent and sovereign jurisdiction until 1810, when Bonaparte incorporated them into the French empire. In 1813 they became free members of the German confederation. In 1866 Frankfort-on-the-Main fell to Prussia. The condition and prosperity of the cities Bremen, Hamburg, and Lübeck, which still retain their freedom and perpetuate the name of the Hanse Towns, clearly demonstrate that, had there been in the Hanse league a firm centralized form of government, no foreign power in Europe or Asia could have prevented the growth and prosperity of a republic able even to control the destinies of Northern Europe.[33]

VI. Iceland. — Among medieval republics, Iceland must not be overlooked. In size the island is about the same as Ireland, being not far from two hundred by three hundred miles in area. There were settlements attempted by adventurers and pirates as early as 860 A. D. In 874 Harold Harfagra, having subdued the petty princes of Norway, put an end to every form of liberty, and ruled the people of his kingdom with absolute despotism. The noblest families would not endure his tyranny. They became voluntary exiles, and under the leadership of Ingolf sailed from homes of comparative luxury to the dreary shores of Iceland. They were followed by other Norwegians, and later by Danes and Swedes, and by a few Scotch and Irish. In 928 a republican form of government was established, at the head of which was a supreme magistrate, elected to office by the free choice of the people. He decided all

disputes and presided at the general assembly (the All-thing), and held his office as long as he retained the confidence of the people. This form of government lasted with uninterrupted harmony for the space of nearly four hundred years.

The luxuries or refinements of life were not possessed in large measure by the Icelanders, though traffic with other countries gave them many domestic comforts which otherwise would have been denied their island home. The people for the most part were farmers, fishermen, and seamen. They were brave, pure in morals, and in a high degree intellectual. In a short time the country attained a measure of prosperity and developed a civilization which in every way far surpassed that of the mother-country. Icelandic enterprise led to the discovery and settlement of Greenland, and the northern shores of America were first made known to Europe, in the year 1001, by a native of Iceland, Biono Heriolforn. The republic was not destitute of scholarship. Her tongue formed the foundation of three Scandinavian languages. The humblest workman could read and write. "There are Icelandic poems so thoroughly imbued with the loftiest ideas and sentiments of modern civilization, and so thoroughly impregnated with the elegance and brilliancy of modern art, that in reading them nobody would believe that they were written in low huts built of lava blocks and moss, and looking out on the dreary gloom of winter of nine months."

But this freedom-loving, enterprising, and scholarly people, after maintaining their liberties through four centuries, became subjects of a kingdom. Party disputes and internal feuds worked the same mischiefs in Iceland as in other

republics. The rich were arrayed against the poor, and communities against communities. Whole families were massacred, estates were burned down, and every kind of property was devastated. This condition of things could not last. The republic was dead. Republics die when persons and property are not safe and when civil rights are not maintained. The national council, in 1261, by universal acquiescence, indeed by universal desire, submitted the sceptre of government to Haco, king of Norway. Iceland remained under the dominion of Norway for upwards of a century, and in 1380, without tumult or opposition, it was transferred to Denmark, under whose rule it has continued to the present time.

CHAPTER II.

I. REPUBLIC OF THE UNITED PROVINCES. — II. THE FRENCH REPUBLIC OF 1792–1804.

The Netherlands, or Low Countries, comprising the entire plain stretching from the foot of the Vosges and the Ardennes to the North Sea, and comprising the present kingdom of the Netherlands, Belgium, and the Northern parts of France, were inhabited in early historic times by Friesic, Germanic, and Gallic families; they were a freedom-loving, brave, and warlike people. By accounts gathered from the writings of Cæsar and Tacitus, it appears that these ancient tribes had maintained their independence against the conquests of the Teutons, the Cimbri, and other nations who had overrun and subdivided the rest of what was then known as Gaul. In the second century these territories passed under Roman domination. Following the decline of the early Roman power, the Franks and the Frieslanders held these territories until the seventh century, when, under Charles Martel, the Friesons were conquered, and the kingdom of the Franks established.

After the conquests of Charlemagne and the introduction of the feudal system, the powerful lords to whom the lands were granted acquired by degrees a sort of sovereignty. But being "unable to maintain themselves without the assistance of their under feudatories, they were compelled,

in order to secure their fidelity, to grant them advantageous conditions of tenure. The clergy, too, by pious usurpations or pious donations, became a powerful and independent corporate body. Thus, during the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, the whole of Belgium and of Batavia was split into several small dominions, the princes of which acknowledged a limited allegiance, some of them to the German empire, and others to the kings of the Franks."

In 1383 the prince of the powerful house of Burgundy, partly by intermarriages, partly by force and purchase, obtained supreme authority over the whole territory which afterwards became the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands. Under the dukes of Burgundy these provinces enjoyed a season of marked prosperity. The Low Countries were looked upon as the workshop of Europe. Agriculture, trade, and commerce were remunerative and extensive; schools of the fine arts were established, and the liberties of the people were interfered with scarcely more than under a republic.

At the death of Charles the Bold, the last of the Burgundian dukes, his eldest daughter Maria received (1477) these countries as her portion, and her grandson, afterwards Charles V., Emperor of Germany, became from the moment of his birth sovereign of the Netherlands and king of Spain. As a part of a great empire, the condition of the provinces was largely changed; though still rich and populous, they were henceforth looked upon as dependencies. Steps were taken by Charles to undermine the privileges which, under former rulers, the Netherland states had defended and enjoyed. The establishment of an in-

perial court in part composed of foreigners, heavy taxation, the introduction of foreign troops, and various other violations of the ancient constitution of the Netherlands, were extremely repugnant to a people hitherto under a wise and paternal government. Towards the close of his reign, after the successful issue of his wars in Germany, Charles resolved to reduce the Netherlands to obedience to the Roman Catholic religion. He began with the severest inquisitional measures, but was obliged to modify them. In 1555 Charles abdicated, and Philip II., his son, ascended the throne. The new monarch, by his arrogance, insincerity, and unconstitutional infringements, at first aggrieved, then enraged his Netherland subjects. His attempts to root out Protestantism, which had taken strong hold upon the hearts of the people, was one of the principal causes that brought on a war lasting forty years, and ending with the humiliation and almost the ruin of Spain, and the establishment of the Netherlands as one of the first powers of Europe.

It was during this period that certain names since famous came into notice, especially those of counts Egmont and Horn, and Prince William the Silent. William, in devotion to his country, in the wisdom of his measures, in his courage and heroism, showed himself one of the most remarkable men of history. He was too early and too intensely engaged in serious matters to have leisure or disposition for the frivolous gossip or the inflated and long-winded speech-making of the age. When, upon a certain occasion, the French king, Henry II., told William that there existed a secret treaty between himself and Philip II. to exterminate by fire and sword all Protestants within their dominions,

though this intelligence must have been to William well-nigh astounding, yet so self-poised was he that the statement was received as carelessly as it had been given. After these facts were known, he was called "The Silent." He could easily talk in the council-chamber when there was a demand for advice, and could give his counsels with great force and clearness; yet, when there were reasons for it, he could remain as silent as a mute, though all the people were demanding a speech. Nevertheless, under the most favorable circumstances, his brilliancy shows with special conspicuousness, not in speech, but upon the field of battle.

This silent man, this military chieftain, who more than once had under his command all the armies of the Netherlands, though often placed under peculiar temptations, never wavered in his loyalty. In 1672, when the French army had advanced into the heart of Holland, Louis offered to make the prince sovereign of the remains of the country. But even in that hour of extreme peril, when hope had abandoned nearly every heart, he answered with his characteristic calmness, "I never will betray a trust, nor sell the liberties of my country, which my ancestors have so long defended."

His confidential friends despaired. One of them, after having long expostulated with William upon his fruitless obstinacy, asked, "Have you considered how and where you will live after Holland is lost?". "I have thought of that," he replied; "I am resolved to live in the lands I have left in Germany. I had rather pass my life in hunting there, than sell my country or my liberty to France at any price." Buckingham and Arlington were sent from

England to try whether, beset by peril, the lure of sovereignty might not seduce him. The former said to him, "Do you not see that the country is lost?" The answer of the prince bespoke the same firm resolution with that which he had made to Zulestein: "I see it is in great danger; but there is a sure way of never seeing it lost, and that is, to die in the last ditch." "The perfect simplicity of these declarations," as Mackintosh remarks, "may authorize us to rank them among the most genuine specimens of true magnanimity. Perhaps the history of the world does not hold out a better example. How high above the reach of fortune the pure principle of obedience to the dictates of conscience, unalloyed by interest, passion, or ostentation, can raise the mind of a virtuous man! To set such an example is an unspeakably more signal service to mankind than all the outward benefits which flow to them from the most successful virtue. It is a principle independent of events, and one that burns most brightly in adversity, the only agent, perhaps, of sufficient power to call forth the native greatness of the soul which lay hid under the cold and unattractive deportment of the Prince of Orange."[34]

This noble prince, ever earnest, dignified, patriotic, taciturn, yet simple and magnanimous, by his courage, by his unyielding persistency, by his diplomatic wisdom, aided seemingly by providential interpositions, worried out and repelled the combined armies of Spain, France, and England. How much the subsequent glory of the republic is due to the influence of such a leader cannot easily be estimated.

In 1607 Spain agreed to a suspension of hostilities for

eight months. Another truce for twelve years was agreed upon, 1609, and by the peace of Westphalia, 1648, the independence of the Republic of the United Provinces was acknowledged by the great powers of Europe. At the dawn of her independence, her citizens had wealth, enterprise, educational advantages, and the military spirit. Her entire population capable of bearing arms was an organized army. Her struggles for liberty had made her patriotic and mighty. Her achievements in science and art, especially in painting, had gained the admiration of the world. Her material prosperity for upwards of a hundred years has been rarely equalled. She was almost absolute master of the seas, and held in her hands the commerce of the world. She perfectly controlled the Baltic; she crushed the Spaniards; she acquired possessions in America and in the East Indies; she checked the Portuguese; she resisted the arrogance of Louis XIV., and more than once made the English nation tremble. After the battle of Goodwin Sands, the admiral Van Tromp tied a broom at his mast-head while sailing along the British coast, as a token that he had swept the Channel of all opposers. Fifteen years later, De Ruyter sailed up the Thames and blockaded the port of London. Historians generally agree that the victories of Holland in 1672 were among the most signal triumphs of a free people over invaders, since the defeat of Xerxes.

Such were the Netherlands in times of their prosperity. Why are there two kingdoms to-day where once stood this great and flourishing republic?

Beginning with the dawn of the republic, there were found in it a number of men having great wealth. After

the declaration of peace, these rich men were enabled to add to their fortunes with great rapidity. To accumulate an immense fortune, if one has ordinary ability, prudence, and a competency to start with, is not difficult. All things human conspire to establish the observation, that "Whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have." As in other republics, so in the Netherlands, the rich grew richer but the poor poorer, and after a time the poor bitterly hated and in various ways worked against the interests of those who were known as capitalists and bondholders. Why should one man have so much more than another? was the question often asked, and whenever asked there was roused anew on part of the poor the spirit of jealousy and discontent.

The great wealth of a comparatively few citizens, and the great poverty of the governments of the several states, resulting in the funding system since followed by other nations, was likewise a constant source of trouble and dispute.

Aside from this class of evils, there were others growing out of political and religious jealousies and hatreds, that kept the republic, for much of the time, in high ferment. The two leading political parties were made up of those on the one hand inclining to monarchy, who constantly sought to raise the stadtholder into a constitutional and hereditary royalty, and those on the other hand who were ever striving for a constitution which should be purely democratic.

In 1677 the power of the ruling stadtholder had become almost supreme, opposition was silenced and seemed

crushed. But though silenced, an opposition in governments always exists. At the conclusion of the peace of 1783, the so-termed "patriots" grew extremely clamorous and threatening. The leaders were not contented with proposing reasonable changes and measures; they were brutal. They grossly insulted the ruling family; the monarch of Prussia, a kinsman, demanded satisfaction. The clamorous boasters refused, but all their boasting stood for nothing when, a little later, the monarch of Prussia marched his army into Holland. In 1794 the French republican flag was displayed upon the frontier; the democrats became active, aggressive, and menacing. The Orange family fled; a new constitution was formed, and the Batavian democratic republic was established.

But it resulted that the measures which had sown these seeds of dissension were to reap for the state a crop of bitterness. The French exacted a part of the Batavian territory. An immediate demand was also enforced for the payment of ten millions sterling. It was further ordered that the army of France should be paid, fed, and clothed at the expense of this new republic. Under this state of things, one part of the Batavian navy was given up to the British by the dissatisfied seamen, and another part was defeated. The colonies of the republic one after another surrendered or were taken by France. The commerce of the state was confined to mere coasting, and, though the bank of Amsterdam was nearly shattered, not a fraction of the pecuniary demands of France was abated.

After twenty years of great distress, most of the time under the military yoke of France, the people, tired and disheartened, demanded, with scarcely a dissenting voice,

that William I. should be the sovereign prince of the land. The Republic of the United Netherlands is, therefore, another illustration of the historic fact so often noticed, that while a pure democracy, with unlimited franchise, may be the ideal government for a people who are wise, moral, and religious, yet, in the hands of a degenerate, selfish, and brutal people, a pure democracy is nothing but a mad delusion.

In 1830 the Romanists, constantly watchful, aggressive, and ever a disturbing factor in national politics, sought and accomplished the secession of the southern provinces, and the separate kingdom of Belgium was erected. To-day two kingdoms, one Roman Catholic, the other fast becoming such, stand upon the ruins of that once flourishing Protestant republic of the United Netherlands.

As these historic republics are seen one after another to rise, flourish, and decline, do they not appear to strike the knell of all existing and future republics?

II. The French Republic of 1792–1804. — The ancient inhabitants of France were subdued by Cæsar half a century before the Christian era, and became in speech and customs quite thoroughly Romanized. In the fifth century, Rome being too weak to defend her provinces, a Gothic-German tribe, called Franks (freemen), conquered the country, and gave it its present name. A rude kingdom was organized under Clovis, who has been termed "a daring and fortunate ruffian." There was very little order in the kingdom until the reign of Charlemagne (768–814). The death of this great emperor was followed by another season of French disorder and of disorganization.

A powerful national feeling showed itself under Louis VI. (1108–1137). In 1589–1643, the Bourbon dynasty, under Henry IV. and Louis XIII., was supreme. Every student of history is impressed with the solemnity and exaltation of royal power as witnessed in France, especially during the later part of that period. There followed the brilliant era of the monarchy, when France was able to dictate to the world fashion and taste in both social customs and literature. Under Louis XIV. (1643–1715), extravagance imposed such an enormous debt upon France that the country was well-nigh exhausted, and the court was completely demoralized. Roman Catholicism availed itself of this condition, becoming aggressive and intolerant. The people, groaning under both civil and religious oppression, thought not of reform but of revolution. Under Louis XV. and XVI. (1715–93), affairs rapidly culminated and the crisis came. A class of men represented by Voltaire, Rousseau, D'Alembert, Montesquieu, and Diderot, with matchless eloquence and irresistible wit, exposed the follies and the abuses of the royal government. The starving people were told that the oppressive monarchy was plotting to steal their very food and was the cause of all their troubles. They were urged to resist; they obeyed.

September 25, 1792, under the leadership of the victorious revolutionists, the Jacobins, France was declared a republic. Then came the despotism of a democratic mob united with the despotism of a democratic dictatorship. All were permitted to taste blood; all were infuriated. Posterity finds it difficult to realize what passed in France during those few years, seemingly centuries long, which

followed.[35] The ordinary death-agencies could not be worked with sufficient rapidity, and resort was had to companies of armed assassins, mitraillades, and scuttle-boats; though Prudhomme, whose connection with the dominant party would lead him not to overestimate, says that upwards of a million persons perished by the guillotine alone.

The revolutionists, more properly the terrorists, were so completely united that they seem to have had but one body and one soul, in which all feelings and desires had united in an insatiable desire for blood. "The more the social body perspires, the sounder it becomes," said Callot d'Herbois. "It is the dead only who never return," said Barrière. "The vessel of the revolution can only arrive in port on a sea reddened with torrents of blood," said St. Just. "A nation is only regenerated on heaps of dead bodies," rejoined Robespierre. Nor were their actions at variance with the creed they professed. For months together these theories were daily carried into practice in every town in France. "Alone and unopposed, the Committee of Public Safety struck numberless blows from one end of the kingdom to the other."

As might be expected, terror rose to its greatest height, and death stood at every door. "The air," said Fouché, "is full of poniards." Despair of life produced its usual diversified effects upon the minds of the horrified. "Some sank into sullen indifference; others indulged in immoderate gaiety; many became frantic with horror; not a few sought to amuse life even at the foot of the scaffold. Rising in one wild and heart-rending chorus might be heard raving, blasphemy, lamentation, commingled with the loud

shouts of obstreperous laughter; in short, all the varied sounds which intimate the absence of hope, and a desperate recklessness of the future."

Such were the legitimate fruits of a pure democracy in the hands of unprincipled and godless leaders. "It was scarlet fever, under whose run hack-drivers in red shirts handled the Portfolio of Foreign Affairs, and street paupers administered the financial matters of the country." Beautiful democratic republic!

At length the Directorial Government approached a crisis. The affairs of state were rent in sunder; the roads were infested with brigands; the rich were vexed on one hand by the extortions of the government, and on the other by the plunderings of the poor. A change was inevitable. The republic had lost its opportunity. All but a few extreme democrats felt, as Sieyes expressed himself, "The chief thing now wanting is a *head*." Bonaparte, knowing the feeling, took much the same step that Cæsar did when crossing the Rubicon: he returned to France. Public sentiment was in his favor; the Directory even "praised and feared, but dared not reproach him." In a modest mansion in the Rue Chantereine, Bonaparte, to make sure of the popular pulse, secluded himself from general observation. The leaders of all parties made overtures. France, torn, bleeding, and despairing of a free and efficient government, prayed for one arm to wield the sovereignty. Bonaparte was appointed First Consul for one year; then a second time for a term of ten years; then for life. While, therefore, in form he was only an officer of the republic, in fact he was sovereign ruler of France. This nominal consular government, between the efforts of the

old royalists on the one hand, who were seeking its overthrow, and on the other hand the ambitious efforts of Bonaparte to establish a new monarchy, could not long continue.

On the 30th of April, 1796, a motion was introduced into the Tribunate to confide the government to an emperor, and to declare the empire hereditary in the family of the First Consul, Napoleon Bonaparte. Most of the tribunes had been pledged beforehand to its support. The heroic opposition of Carnot is praiseworthy, and his historic reference to Rome was very suggestive.[36] But the time had passed; his words were unheeded. The motion prevailed, was subsequently communicated to the senate, and by that body was ratified.

Napoleon lost no time in assuming and exercising the powers belonging to the sovereignty thus conferred. Eighteen of his favorite generals were made marshals of the empire, and Napoleon's power was complete. "Addresses now flowed in from all parts of the hundred and eight departments into which the territory of the imperial republic was divided. The authorities, the functionaries, the magistracy, and the army, all brought to the foot of the throne assurances of the most profound devotion. Harassed with the convulsions of a long anarchy, the people now invoked the repose of servitude. The despotism of one man seemed to them a small evil compared with the tyranny of the factions."

Imola, who urged his flock in 1797 to take sides with the democratic revolutionists, forgetting his ardent republicanism, hastened, in 1804, to crown Napoleon, in Nôtre Dame, Emperor of France.

Thus, after an existence of twelve years, expired the French Republic, which so many of her orators and rhetoricians had pronounced to be "forever *indivisible* and *imperishable*." [37, 38].

III.

EXISTING REPUBLICS; EXCLUSIVE OF THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER I.

EUROPEAN REPUBLICS.

I. San Marino. — In Italy, a few miles southwest from Rimini, and four from the shores of the Adriatic, is situated La Republica di San Marino, the oldest republic of the world. Addison, who visited there in 1700, gives the following account of its origin:

"The inhabitants as well as the historians who mention this little republic give the following account of its original. St. Marino was its founder — a Dalmatian by birth, and by trade a mason. He was employed about thirteen hundred years ago in the reparation of Rimini, and after he had finished his work retired to this solitary mountain, as finding it very proper for the life of a hermit, which he led in the greatest rigors and austerities of religion. He had not been long here before he wrought a reputed miracle, which, joined with his extraordinary sanctity, gained him so great an esteem that the princess of the country made him a present of the mountain, to dispose of at his own discretion. His reputation quickly peopled it, and gave rise to the republic which calls itself after his name, so that the commonwealth of Marino may boast at least of a nobler original than that of Rome, the one having been an asylum for robbers and murderers, and the other a resort of persons eminent for their piety and devotion."

San Marino at present embraces five villages, has less than eight thousand inhabitants, an extent of territory not over twenty-two square miles, and is entirely mountainous. There is a standing army which includes nearly every one who is able to bear arms. The general government is intrusted to a council of sixty, the chief officer being termed Captain-Regent. The people are not much vexed with the troublesome questions of finance; they use Italian coinage, and the annual expenses of government, including army, police, post-office, and education, do not exceed twenty-five thousand francs (five thousand dollars). The republic is neither blessed nor afflicted with a newspaper or printing-press. In one respect at least the government is high-toned — it rigorously excludes from its domains all gambling establishments. Says a recent visitor:

"Parties from distant parts of Europe had offered, for the gaming privilege, to construct new roads, establish telegraphs, and multiply facilities of all kinds for communicating with the outer world; but the Captain-Regent had manfully resisted the temptation, and had even exterminated the game of Biribisso, which had also begun to prevail to some extent within his dominions."

There is one prison, but at latest accounts it was without an occupant. There are manifest reasons why this republic has so long maintained its existence amid the many revolutions of medieval and modern Europe. She has never intermeddled in the affairs of surrounding governments; she is not herself a prize of sufficient value to tempt the stronger powers of Europe to interfere with her civil liberty; she has a homogeneous population, and her people have from the earliest times been characterized by good

sense, energy, prudence, industry, and economy. If her citizens do not degenerate, and if outside parties do not interfere, San Marino bids fair to remain an independent state for the coming thousand years.

II. Andorra. — Situated on the Spanish side of the eastern Pyrenees is another miniature republic, bearing the name Andorra. It has an area of about six hundred and fifty square miles, is surrounded by high mountains, is divided into six parishes, and has a population of less than seven thousand. Andorra has been independent since the time of Charlemagne, who, about the year 790, declared it a free state, in reward for services rendered by its inhabitants when he was making a passage through the dangerous defiles of the mountains of Catalonia, to wage war upon the Moors in Spain.

The government is composed of a supreme council of twenty-four members, of whom each parish elects four. The chief executive, whose term of office is for life, unless impeached or otherwise incapacitated, is chosen by the supreme council. Justice is administered by two judges. The expenses of the government are trifling, and are defrayed by a rental tax paid by owners of flocks for the use of public pasture lands.

Andorra is under the nominal protection of France, and pays to that country an annual tribute of 960 francs for the privilege of importing, free of duty, certain specified French commodities which the country needs, but cannot produce.

Each parish has a school, in which, however, little more than the rudiments of education are taught. The people

are mostly farmers and stock-raisers, speak the Catalan language, are robust, homogeneous, of an independent spirit, simple, frugal, industrious, and somewhat severe in their manners, and yet are notably hospitable. They have maintained the military spirit from their earliest history; all the inhabitants capable of bearing arms are reviewed once a year. The Andorrans more than once manfully resisted Spanish invasions, and during the wars of the Pyrenees rendered France a service which has never been forgotten. Judging from present appearances, this republic, which already has a history of nearly twelve hundred years, is likely to remain while many other governments, far more pretentious, are sinking into dark graves yawning to receive them.

III. SWITZERLAND. — Among mountain republics of limited territory is classed the Confederation of Switzerland. It is situated in the heart of Europe, has an area of a trifle less than sixteen thousand square miles, and occupies the culminating territory of the continent, sloping in every direction towards the surrounding seas. There are traces of a prehistoric people, the "lake-dwellers," probably of Asiatic origin, who were doubtless exterminated by the ancestors of the Helveti, the first inhabitants of Switzerland, whose name has been transmitted to history. These Helveti, who received from the Romans the name of "Confederates," were almost constantly engaged in war with surrounding tribes and nations. Up to 879 A. D., Switzerland had been successively under the domination of the Romans, the Ostrogoths, the Alemans, the Burgundians, and the Franks. Against each of these powers she

had fought for her freedom, and later against also the Austrians and the French. The Thirty Years' War nearly put an end to the Swiss Confederation, but by the treaty of Westphalia (1648) Switzerland was declared independent of the German empire. Disorders reigned and malcontents multiplied, until the death of Louis XIV. Under the French Directory, Switzerland was converted into a republic, "one and indivisible." This lasted four years. The reply of the First Consul to a delegation sent to Paris, 1802, asking what form should be given to the new constitution which Switzerland had in view, was wise: "Nature made you to be a federative state; no reasonable man attempts to conquer nature." This government was followed by a league based upon federal principles, which, at the fall of the French empire, ten years later, came to an end. By the Congress of Vienna (1815) her independence was again acknowledged and guaranteed.

There followed an era of constitution-making, at first inclining to state rights, or, as it has been termed, state independence. This tendency was found by the wisest minds of the republic to be inexpedient and unsafe. The republic, in 1848, became a united confederacy.[39] The love for cantons has given place to the love for Switzerland.

The present constitution came into force May 29, 1874, having received, April 19, 1874, the national sanction by a general vote of the people. It vests the supreme legislative and executive authority in a parliament of two chambers—a State Council, and a National Council. The first is composed of forty-four members, two from each of the twenty-two cantons of the Confederation. The National Council consists of one hundred and thirty-five represent-

atives, chosen in direct election, at the rate of one representative for every twenty thousand persons.

A general election takes place once in three years. Every citizen who has reached the age of twenty years is entitled to a vote; and any voter, not a clergyman, may be elected a representative. Both chambers united are called the Federal Assembly, and as such represent the supreme government of the republic. It alone has the right to declare war, make peace, and conclude alliances and treaties with other nations. The chief executive authority is deputed to a Federal Council, consisting of seven members, elected for three years by the Federal Assembly. Every citizen entitled to a vote in the National Council is eligible to membership in this executive branch of government.

The president and vice-president of the Federal Council are the first magistrates of the republic, and are elected by the Federal Assembly. The Swiss people guard against the dangers of a continued term in the presidency by restricting it to one year, and by making both the president and vice-president ineligible at the succeeding election. But they do not ever after deprive themselves of the presidential services of able and worthy men; they allow both president and vice-president to be re-eligible after the expiration of one year.

Each of the cantons has its local government, based, in every instance, upon the principle of the absolute sovereignty of the people.

The military spirit is fostered throughout Switzerland, and her military organization is one of the most perfect in Europe. The laws of the republic forbid the maintenance of a standing army within her limits. The 18th article of

the Constitution of 1874 enacts that "every Swiss is liable to serve in the defence of his country." Article 19 enacts that "the Federal army shall consist of all men liable to military service, and both the army and the war material shall be at the disposal of the Confederation. In cases of emergency the Confederation shall have also the exclusive and undivided right of disposing of the men who do not belong to the Federal army, and of all the other military forces of the cantons. The cantons shall dispose of the defensive force of their respective territories in so far as their power to do so is not limited by the constitutional or legal regulations of the Confederation." Article 20 provides that "the Confederation shall enact all laws relative to the army, and watch over their due execution; it also shall provide for the education of the troops, and bear the cost of all military expenditure which is not provided for by the legislatures of the cantons."

The troops of the republic are divided into two classes: First, the "Bundes-auszug," or Federal army, consisting of all men able to bear arms, from the age of twenty to thirty-two. Each canton is obliged, by the terms of the constitution, to furnish at least three per cent. of its population to the Federal army. Second, the "Landwehr," or militia, comprising all men from the thirty-third to the completed forty-fourth year. The strength and organization of the armed forces of Switzerland was as follows at the end of September, 1879: Federal army, 105,378; militia, 97,019; total, 202,397. The men of both the Federal army and the reserve militia are called together in their respective cantons for annual drill, a week or more for the infantry, and two weeks or more for the cavalry and artil-

lery. In addition to this, the troops of several contiguous cantons assemble once or twice yearly for general muster. The military instruction of the Federal army is given to officers not permanently appointed or paid, but who must have undergone a course of education, and passed an examination at one of the training establishments erected for the purpose. Switzerland, therefore, has between two and three hundred thousand troops, drilled, organized, and equipped, whenever the Federal Assembly deems it necessary to call them into service.

The Swiss authorities jealously guard against increasing the national debt. For many years, except 1871, when there was a deficit caused by increased expenses necessitated by the Franco-German war, the receipts have exceeded the expenditures. The government is also wise and vigorous in its educational measures. Parents are compelled by law to send their children to school, or to have them privately taught, between the ages of six and twelve; neglect may be punished by fine, and, in some cases, by imprisonment. The law hitherto has not always been enforced in Roman Catholic cantons, but is rigidly carried out in those where Protestants form the majority. In every district there are primary schools, where the elements of education, including geography and history, are taught; and schools of higher grade for youths of from twelve to fifteen, where instruction is given in modern languages, geometry, natural history, the fine arts, and music. In both these schools the rich and the poor are educated together, the latter being admitted gratuitously.[40] Swiss schools have a high reputation throughout Europe, and it is estimated that

half the governesses on the Continent are educated in Switzerland.

The government likewise has legislated judiciously as to religious toleration, and freedom in case of all creeds and societies that do not endanger the civil government. The constitution of 1874 has the following enactments: "There shall be complete and absolute liberty of conscience and of creed. No one can incur any penalties whatever on account of his religious opinions. The person who exercises the paternal authority or that of guardian, has the right to dispose of the religious education of children up to the age of sixteen years. No one is bound to pay taxes specially appropriated to defraying the expenses of a creed to which he does not belong. The free exercise of worship is guaranteed within the limits compatible with public order and proper behavior. The cantons can take the necessary measures for the maintenance of public order and peace between the members of the different religious communities, as well as against the encroachments of ecclesiastical authorities on the rights of the citizens of the state. All disputes arising from the creation of new religious communities, or schisms in existing bodies, shall be referred to the Federal authorities. No bishopries can be created on Swiss territory without the approbation of the Confederation. The order of Jesuits and its affiliated societies cannot be received in any part of Switzerland; all functions clerical and scholastic are forbidden to its members, and the interdiction can be extended to any other religious orders whose action is dangerous to the state, or interferes with the peace of different creeds. The foundation of new convents or religious orders is forbidden."

Switzerland in many respects is also extremely fortunate in her population. Less than six per cent. of her citizens are foreigners, there being, according to the census of 1870, not one Irish Roman Catholic voter within her territory. The Swiss are frugal and industrious; indeed, no people on earth surpass them in these respects. The herdsman is found everywhere among her rocky retreats with his flocks, and no foot of available soil is allowed by the thrifty farmer to remain idle.

The cities of Switzerland are not so thronged as are those of other European states. The population dwells chiefly in small towns, hamlets, and villages. At the census of 1870 there were but five towns in Switzerland with more than twenty thousand inhabitants, namely, Geneva, Basel, Bern, Lausanne, and Zurich. The soil of the country is very equally divided among the population. It is estimated that nearly nine-tenths of the families occupy homes and lands of their own. The home and the few acres of land lie at the foundation of much of Swiss patriotism, constitute one of her strongest bulwarks, and harmoniously unite her people into a happy and flourishing republic. The increase of population has been very steady in recent years. The surplus of births over deaths, in five years from 1873 to 1877, was one hundred and nine thousand four hundred and twenty-six. The people seemed to have been governed by a native wisdom that might be shaped into the following maxim: "Remain at home, and you will prosper as well as if you go abroad." Emigration, as a matter of fact, has been for several years on the decrease. Again: "Attract strangers to the country by honest treatment, and they will be more inclined to buy

your wares." A branch of industry that is acquiring no small extent and value, is that of wood-carving. Many of the productions are so elaborate and beautiful, that one can hardly resist the temptation to buy. Not only large communities are thus supported, but in hundreds of hamlets and isolated *châlets*, during the long and dreary winters, is this industry vigorously prosecuted.

Again they say: "What distinguishes our country is her natural scenery; let us, therefore, make it a national resource." They accordingly built excellent highways, erected commodious hotels, explored and surveyed their lofty mountains, and entered upon the systematic business of exhibiting to the world their magnificent scenery. It is this practical employment of the natural features of Switzerland which has now become the source of much of the prosperity of the republic.

The authorities are seeking to prevent every kind of extortion, which in other countries is freely practised upon travellers. They have discussed the subject of beggary with great care, and publicly advise all tourists not to give to professional beggars, as the best means of making them abandon their profession. One may therefore travel in most parts of Switzerland, with no suspicion of being jewed. The guides, coachmen, burden-bearers, and nearly all who systematically come into contact with the traveller, are now regulated by a legal tariff which they dare not transcend. In most places the traveller may mount a horse, or step into a coach, tell the driver where to go, ask for the tariff list, pay it, and dismiss him without bickering or overcharge.

In a word, Switzerland, after emerging from five centuries of desperate struggle for independence, has proved to

the world that by living honestly and prudently, and by developing and cultivating such resources as God has given, a people having but small territory and extremely limited resources may take an honorable rank among the most enlightened and highly-favored nations of the earth.

If Switzerland continues to maintain her ennobling military spirit, her system of education, her habits of frugality and thrift, if Roman Catholicism does not gain the ascendency, and if immigration does not soil her citizenship, the Alps bid fair to remain, for years, the home of a people strong, prosperous, and independent.

IV. FRANCE.[41]—A Frenchman died recently in Pau, the capital of the department of Basses-Pyrenées, at one hundred and four years of age. He had witnessed the reigns of Louis XV., Louis XVI., the Convention, Directory, Consulate, Empire, Louis XVIII., the Hundred Days, the Restoration, Charles X., the Revolution of 1830, Louis Philippe, the Revolution of 1848, the Republic, the Empire, and the beginning of the present Republic. The wonder is that anything is left in France, out of which to organize another independent and orderly state. And yet, it may be safely said that France was never more prosperous than now, and, all things considered, but few states in Europe are better off.[42]

The present constitution, voted by the National Assembly elected in 1871, bears the date of February 25, 1875. It vests the legislative power in an assembly of two houses, the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, and the executive power in a chief magistrate called President of the Republic. The Chamber of Deputies is elected by universal

suffrage, under the "scrutin d'arrondissement," adopted by the National Assembly, November 11, 1875. It was enacted that every arrondissement should elect one deputy, and if its population be in excess of 100,000, an additional deputy for each 100,000, or portion thereof. The only requisite to be an elector is to be possessed of citizenship and to be of the age of twenty-one years. The only requisite for a deputy is to be a citizen and twenty-five years of age. There are five hundred and thirty-two members in the Chamber of Deputies. The Senate is composed of three hundred members, of which two hundred and twenty-five are elected by the departments of France and the colonies, and seventy-five were nominated, in the first instance, by the National Assembly, and subsequently are elected by the Senate. The senators for the departments are elected by electoral colleges for the term of nine years, retiring by thirds every three years, while those nominated by the National Assembly, or elected by the Senate, sit for life. No other qualification is required for a senator than to be a Frenchman and forty years of age. The Senate and the Chamber of Deputies assemble annually on the second Tuesday in January, unless previously summoned by the President of the Republic. They must remain in session at least five months every year. The Chamber of Deputies is elected for the term of four years.

The President of the Republic has the right of convoking the Chambers should circumstances warrant, and is bound to convoke them if the demand is made by one-half of the number of members composing each Chamber. The President can adjourn the Chambers, but the adjournment cannot exceed the term of one month, nor occur more than twice

the same session. With the assent of the Senate, he may dissolve the Chamber of Deputies before the legal expiration of its term, but in such event the electoral colleges must be summoned for new elections within three months. The ministers as a body are responsible to the Chambers for the general policy of the government, and individually for their personal acts. The President of the Republic is elected by majority vote in the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, united in National Assembly. He is nominated for seven years, and is eligible for re-election. He promulgates the laws when they have been voted by the two Chambers, and watches over and insures their execution. He has the right of individual pardon, but cannot proclaim a general amnesty. He disposes of the armed force and appoints to all civil and military posts, including the heads of the ministerial departments. Every act of the President of the Republic must be countersigned by a Minister of State. The President can be impeached only in case of high-treason. In the event of a vacancy by death, or any other cause, the two united Chambers must proceed immediately to the election of a new President.

The population of France at the census of 1872 was upward of thirty-five and a quarter millions, a fraction over ninety-eight per cent. being, at least nominally, Roman Catholics.

The Colonial Possessions of France, dispersed over Asia, Africa, America, and Polynesia, and including the so-called "Pays protégés," or countries under protection, have a total area of 335,629 English square miles, with a population of six and a quarter millions. Not comprised in the list is Algeria, which has a government and laws distinct

from the other colonial possessions, being looked upon, partly from its proximity to France, and partly from serving as camp and practice-field for a large portion of the standing army, as a sort of annex of the mother-country. Algeria, as well as all the other colonies, are represented in the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, and are considered, politically, a part of France.

France in many respects is highly favored. More than eighteen and a half millions of her people are engaged in agriculture. Land is very equally divided among the entire population. According to the latest official returns the cultivated land of France was divided into five million five hundred and fifty thousand distinct properties. Of this total, the estates averaging six hundred acres numbered fifty thousand, and those averaging sixty acres five hundred thousand, while there were five millions having less than six acres.

There is scarcely any emigration from France; the only exodus of any extent taking place in recent years consisted in a movement of the Basques, in the department of the Hautes-Pyrénées, to quit the country in order to escape military service.

All religions are equal by law, but none except the Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, have state allowances. The power of Romanism is constantly declining.

Public education in France is entirely under the supervision of the government, but to a great extent, partly directly, but much more indirectly, is intrusted by the state to the hands of the Roman Catholic clergy. Accompanying the general census of 1872, there was an official inquiry into the educational condition of the nation, which was

very carefully made, and gave the following results: Nine-tenths of the children under six; more than a fifth, but less than a fourth of the youths of both sexes under twenty; and more than a third of the grown-up population of men and women, are unable to read or write. Setting aside the four millions of children under six years of age, it was estimated that thirty per cent. of the population of France are entirely destitute of education.

The military forces of France are in a state of reorganization. The first article of the law of 1872 enacts universal liability to arms: "Tout Français doit le service militaire personnel." By Arts. second and fourth, substitution and enlistment for money are forbidden; and by Art. third it is ordered that "every Frenchman not declared unfit for military service may be called up, from the age of twenty to that of forty years, to enter the active army or the reserves." The constitution of these divisions of the armed forces is prescribed in the third chapter, the first article, as follows: "Every Frenchman not declared unfit for military service must be five years in the Active Army, four years in the Reserve of the Active Army, five years in the Territorial Army, and six years in the Reserve of the Territorial Army. The Active Army is composed of all young men, not otherwise exempted, who have reached the age of twenty, and the Reserve of those who have passed through the Active Army. Neither the Active Army nor its Reserve are in any way localized, but drawn from and distributed over the whole of France. On the other hand, the Territorial Army and its Reserve are spread over fixed regions, determined from time to time by administrative enactments. The principle of universal liability to bear

arms, laid down at the beginning, is not carried out strictly in all the enactments of the law of 1872, which admits of the usual exemptions from military service. The total effective force of the French army, both in men, including officers, rank and file, and in horses, was reported as follows to the Chamber of Deputies in the session of 1879: men, five hundred and two thousand six hundred and ninety-seven; horses, one hundred and twenty thousand eight hundred and ninety-four. The navy of France was composed, at the end of 1879, of fifty-nine ironclads, two hundred and sixty-four screw steamers, sixty-two paddle steamers, and one hundred and thirteen sailing vessels.

The rapidity with which France rallied from the Franco-German war, the ease with which she passed from an empire to a republic, her great activity in agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, her military strength, and her national credit, have been a great and almost startling surprise to the world. If for a quarter of a century this prosperity and orderly government continues, there will be occasion for still greater surprise.

CHAPTER II.

REPUBLICS OF AFRICA.

REPUBLICAN institutions had their origin among the Israelites in Asia; that continent is to-day the only one not having a republic. Carthage fell, and Africa was left for twenty centuries without republican institutions. There are now in Africa three republics, though scarcely of sufficient importance to awaken for them the interest of the other nations of the earth.

I. LIBERIA. — This republic, situated on the west coast of Africa, was founded in 1820 by the American Colonization Society, and was organized as an independent state in 1847. It was first acknowledged by England, afterwards by France, Belgium, Prussia, Brazil, Denmark, Portugal, and in 1861 by the United States. The republic has about six hundred miles of coast-line, and extends into the interior, on an average, one hundred miles. Its area is constantly increasing by purchases from the surrounding natives. The estimated total citizenship is seven hundred and twenty thousand, all belonging to the African race. Nineteen thousand are Americo-Liberians, and the remainder are aboriginal inhabitants. Monrovia, the capital, has an estimated population of thirteen thousand.

The Americo-Liberians have a regular system of schools, and show a commendable degree of advancement, in the arts of civilization. The constitution of the republic is modelled after that of the United States of America. All men, politically, are born free and equal. Elections take place by ballot, and every male citizen who possesses real estate has the right of suffrage. But there is a temporary provision that no white man can be admitted to citizenship, and none but citizens can hold real estate in the republic. The executive is vested in a president and a non-active vice-president, and the legislative power is exercised by a parliament of two houses, called the Senate and House of Representatives. The president and vice-president are elected for two years; the House of Representatives also for two years, and the Senate for four years. There are thirteen members of the lower house and eight of the upper house, each county sending two members to the senate. It is provided that, on the increase of the population, each ten thousand persons shall be entitled to an additional representative. Both the president and the vice-president must be thirty-five years of age, and have real property to the value of six hundred dollars. In case of the absence or death of the president, his post is filled by the vice-president. The latter is also president of the Senate, which, in addition to being one of the branches of the legislature, is a council for the president, he being required to submit to it treaties and appointments for ratification.

The president may be re-elected without limit. The first president, Joseph Jenkins Roberts, served four terms, from 1848 to 1856, and was again re-elected in 1871. The president is assisted in his executive duties by four ministers —

the secretary of state, the secretary of the treasury, the attorney-general, and the postmaster-general.

For political and judicial purposes, the republic is divided into four states, Montserrado, Grand Bassa, Sinoe, and Maryland, each of which is subdivided into townships.

In August, 1871, the republic laid the foundation of a public debt by contracting a loan of five hundred thousand dollars, at seven per cent. interest, to be redeemed in fifteen years. The loan was issued in England. No interest has ever been paid, the government of the republic being bankrupt.

The establishment of the Republic of Liberia was an attempt made by American philanthropists to prove the capacity of the negro race for self-government. The results are not what were expected. There has been much political disorder. The climate is deadly to white men and enervating to all except the natives.

II. Orange River Free State. — This republic, situated in eastern South Africa, is bounded east by Natal, south by Cape Colony, and north by the Transvaal Republic. It has an area of about fifty thousand square miles, and was under British dominion from 1848 to 1854, but was then abandoned. When Natal, in 1856, was erected from a settlement to a separate colony under the British crown, the Dutch settlers were dissatisfied. They left Natal and took possession of the Orange River territory and formed an independent republic, now called the Orange River Free State. It has a population ranging between thirty and forty thousand.

III. Transvaal Republic. — The history of the establishment of this republic is similar to that of the Orange River Free State. Certain whites who were tired of the English rule in Cape Colony and Natal left their homes and retreated north into the wilderness, and in 1858 organized themselves into a free and independent state. The territory under the rule of this republic is bounded north by the Kaffir country, south by Natal and the Orange Republic, east by the Portuguese possessions and the Zulu country, and west by the Hart and Limpope rivers. It has an area of about one hundred and fifteen thousand square miles, and is thought to be richer in minerals than any other part of the world. The inhabitants comprise about two hundred and fifty thousand Kaffirs and thirty thousand whites. The whites live apparently an easy life, chiefly upon widely scattered farms. The government consists of a president, who is the chief executive, and a legislative assembly.

What fate awaits these African republics, whether they will be kept within their present narrow limits or extend their territories as the continent is explored and civilized; whether they will continue their existence for centuries to come, or anon be engaged in such civil wars, or in wars among themselves, as shall terminate their existence, are as yet matters of pure speculation.

CHAPTER III.

THE REPUBLICS OF AMERICA.

WITHOUT affirming or denying anything respecting the doubtful question of a race of beings in America resembling men and prophetic of the Adamic race, but who were entirely destroyed during the geologic drift period, we adopt the theory that the Indian tribes of the northern and eastern portions of North America, together with the Mound-builders, Cave-dwellers, and civilized peoples of the western states, Mexico, Central America, and the great Peruvian empire, belonged to the family of Adam, and were the immediate descendants of the primitive people inhabiting northeastern Asia. Probably between ten and twenty centuries ago, those people, perhaps to escape the despotisms of Asia, from time to time crossed Behring Straits, or the Sea of Kamtchatka, upon the ice or by boats, different groups and families, according to their tastes and circumstances, choosing different localities and different modes of life.[43] There are indications that several centuries later the barbarians and nomadic tribes of the north and east preyed upon the more civilized people of the southwest, much as the Goths and Vandals, during the Middle Ages, invaded and devastated southern Europe. On the American continent the rude invaders were successful in nearly obliterating the

primitive civilization, without being themselves improved by contact with it. Mighty aboriginal tribes throughout the northern and eastern territories of America, ruined fortifications and cities in the south and west, and a waning civilization in Mexico, Central America, and in the territories of the Peruvian empire, were found by Europeans upon their discovery and conquest of the American continent.

I. The United States of Mexico. — Probably not far from 500 A. D. the Toltecks occupied the Mexican tablelands. The ancient towns and cities visited by Stevenson, which have been for ages partially covered by dense tropical growths of vegetation, and whose ruins still strike with awe the traveller penetrating the forests overgrowing them, point to an earlier civilization than that existing at the time of the Spanish conquests, and were undoubtedly of Tolteck construction. Five or six centuries later the Toltecks were subdued by the Aztecs, who upon the ruins of that earlier and higher civilization erected their own. Among the Aztecs were orators and poets, architects and sculptors, of more than ordinary intelligence and skill.

When Cortez (1518–1520) made his conquest of Mexico, the eighth of the Montezuman line of monarchs ruled a territory of one hundred and thirty thousand square miles, containing two million subjects. The Spaniards held Mexico for three hundred years, the country meanwhile receiving from Spain large numbers of immigrants. During this period the country was involved in no foreign wars nor in any important internal revolutions. Quietly a race-fusion was taking place between the native Indian and the conquering Castilian races. After a century or

more, the few pure Spanish families remaining monopolized all positions of honor, came into possession of the great landed estates, and controlled the commerce and wealth of the country. Against the arrogance and domination of these almost feudal lords, who were constantly priding themselves upon their pure Castilian blood, the mass of their descendants, Creoles, born in Mexico, at length rebelled. They were also angered against the mother-land because she adopted the policy of excluding from the offices of state and from military rank any but native Spaniards. The Mestizos, half-bloods between Spaniards and native Mexicans, for a time prevented the Creoles from engaging in open rebellion. But when the Peninsular War began to embarrass Spain, all Mexico seemed stirred with a desire for independence. Hidalgo, a parish priest, was the first to appear in the field, and in 1810 headed a rebellion of the Mestizos against the government. Insurrection followed insurrection, instigated and led sometimes by priests and sometimes by military men, outlaws, and desperadoes. The leaders in these revolutions did not at first intend to establish a republic, but simply desired a change of imperial rulers. Spain, however, refused to allow a native to take the Mexican crown, and thereupon Iturbide, the "Liberator," was proclaimed emperor.

At the fall of Iturbide, the army, being in the ascendant, organized a republic, and Mexico was thus unexpectedly freed entirely from Spanish domination. There followed a period of intrigue and revolution, during which different generals of the army struggled to gain supreme power.

In 1822 Santa Anna proclaimed a republic, but its constitution had little in common with republics of modern date.

State affairs were in fearful disorder. Presidents were elected and rejected with the greatest irregularity. General Santa Anna, as an illustration, was frequently in the extremes of success and adversity, "one month sitting in the presidential chair, armed with almost despotic power, the next a refugee and exile." Whenever the power came into the hands of the commonalty they wielded it in vengeance. The gachupines, or aristocracy, were in various ways persecuted, were despoiled of their colossal fortunes, and in 1829 were expelled from the country.

A constitution was at length formed, copied largely from that of the United States, but it proved too radical for a country lately under imperial and Roman Catholic sway, and in consequence was overthrown in 1833. During the twenty years following, Mexico was under military leadership, which, in 1855, under the triumph of the "plan of Ayutla," during the fifth dictatorship of Santa Anna, came to an end. A constituent assembly was organized the following year, and in 1857 it promulgated a constitution, which is essentially the one under which the republic is governed to-day. It embodies the most pronounced principles of modern republicanism, and in consequence was not supported by the conservative classes, consisting of the aristocracy, certain military leaders, and the church party, who by various intrigues brought on two memorable struggles: "the war of reform" (1857–60), and "French intervention" (1861–67), including the brief empire under Ferdinand Maximilian.

By the terms of the constitution, Mexico is a federative republic, divided at present into twenty-seven states, one territory, Lower California, and a federal district. The

powers of the supreme government are divided into three branches—the legislative, executive, and judiciary. The legislative power is vested in a Congress consisting of a House of Representatives and a Senate, and the executive in a President. Representatives, elected by each state, at the rate of one for eighty thousand inhabitants, hold their places for two years. The congressional qualifications are, that the candidate shall be twenty-five years of age and eight years a resident of the republic. The Senate consists of two members for each state, of at least thirty years of age, who are elected by a plurality of votes in the State Congress. The President and Vice-President are elected by the Congress of the States, and hold office for four years. They are at any time eligible for re-election. Congress must meet annually from January 1 to April 15, and a Council of Government, consisting of the Vice-President and half the Senate, sits during the remainder of the year.

General Porfirio Diaz, proclaimed President of the republic, as successor of Don Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada, March 4, 1877, was installed in power in consequence of a revolution which overthrew his predecessor. The administration of the republic is carried on, under the direction of the President, by a council of six ministers, heads of the departments of Justice, Finance, the Interior, Army and Navy, Foreign Affairs, and Public Works.

The area of the republic is estimated at nearly seven hundred and fifty thousand square miles, and the population at upwards of nine and a quarter millions. The finances of the country are in great disorder. There has been no official monetary statement since the reign of Maximilian. The expenditures for the past twenty years

have been annually in excess of the revenue. The bonded debt is now between four and five hundred million dollars. The present government, however, does not recognize any portion of its liabilities except a six per cent. internal Mexican debt of seven millions; the interest upon this, however, has not, for many years, been paid.

It is estimated that five millions, or more than one half, of the population of the republic, are pure Indians, the rest comprising a mixture of various races, the white, or European-descended inhabitants, numbering about five hundred thousand.

Political distinctions formerly existing were abolished by the constitution of 1824. All persons, of whatever race or color, are now admitted to citizenship and to the enjoyment of equal civil and political rights. The mineral wealth of Mexico has always been famous, and its agricultural products abundant. It has schools of law, medicine, music, agriculture, engineering, mines, commerce, fine arts, the sciences, and literature, and a military college maintained at public expense. There are between four and five thousand public schools, which are rapidly increasing.

A recent student of Mexican affairs, for several years a resident of that country, though a citizen of the United States, reports that in civil and religious polity the country is at present nearly a unit. Not one in a thousand of the citizens incline to either a monarchy or aristocracy. The mass of the people love the republic. He further states that during the last seven years the republic has been very prosperous, and that no republic in the world seems more permanent.

The civil administration has jealously guarded itself

against its most dangerous foe, the Roman Catholic church. There is not at present a nunnery, monastery, nun, sister of charity, nor Jesuit, in all Mexico: they are excluded by law. Says a recent visitor to Mexico: "Religious processions are proscribed. The holy wafer is carried to dying people no longer in a gilded coach, but in a private carriage, the bared head of the driver being the only sign by which the faithful can know it. So great has the irreverence grown, that a native, pointing to the *sagrario*, where the gilded coach is still kept, said to me, 'They keep in there what they call the *Holy Ghost coach*, but I call it the hell-cart.'"

The president has assured Protestant religious workers from the United States that their property and life shall be protected, if necessary, by the entire civil and military power of the republic. Thirty years ago the Romish church in Mexico, in proportion to the number of its communicants, was richer than anywhere else in the world. She held two thirds of the property of the city of Mexico. Mortgages were held by her over a large portion of the country. She controlled the money and landed interest of all the great centres of trade; and convents covering hundreds of acres were adorned with the highest art. The church was rich, elegant, luxurious, but corrupt. The government deemed it necessary for the public good to crush this gigantic worldly power which had intrenched itself under the name of religion. This was done. To-day the Romish church of Mexico, in proportion to the number of its communicants, is poorer than anywhere else in the world.

If the government of the United States is wise, there will

be no interference with this Mexican republic. Her territories are not needed by us. We should not be too easily provoked by a few troubles upon the borders. Mexico has untold resources. When they are developed she may become, what will not harm us, a grand rival republic; and at some time she may prove a needed and powerful ally in maintaining republican institutions upon this continent.

> "Thou Italy of the Occident,
> Glorious, gory Mexico!"

II. Central America. — Central America, properly belonging to North America, lying between the parallels of about 7° and 18° north latitude, has an area, according to Behm, of a trifle above one hundred and eighty-eight thousand square miles. In 1502 Columbus sailed along the east coast, but his landing being opposed by both his crew and the natives, he returned to Spain. In 1523 Pedro Alvarado, under the command of Cortez, undertook the conquest of the country, and within two years brought it into complete subjection.

At that time Central America was known as the kingdom of Guatemala. In its tropical and tangled forests were the massive ruins of Aztec cities, which displayed wonderful skill in both design and architecture. Central America, in common with Mexico, was for three centuries under Spanish domination. After the revolution of 1821 it was attached to the Mexican kingdom under Iturbide, but became free at his abnegation. In 1823 the four states of Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and San Salvador, formed an independent federal union, under the name United States of Central America. These states did not

long cohere, and five independent republics took the place of the confederation. In passing south from Mexico we enter first —

1. *The Republic of Guatemala.* — It was established in 1839, and is at present governed under a constitution proclaimed in 1859. There are thirteen provinces or states, with a population of nearly one million two hundred thousand. By the terms of the constitution the legislative power is vested in a Congress of two chambers, called the Council of State and the House of Representatives, the first consisting of twenty-four and the second of fifty-two members. Both chambers are elected for four years, the House of Representatives by the people, and the Council of State by the House. The executive is vested in a President, elected for four years. Since 1871, when the Roman Catholic church party was driven from power, there have been several irregular presidential elections.

Bounding Guatemala upon the southeast, is —

2. *The Republic of Honduras.* — It was established in 1839, on the dissolution of the confederation of Central America, has a population of two hundred and fifty thousand, and is governed under a constitution proclaimed November, 1865. There are seven states. The constitution gives the legislative power to a Congress of two houses, called the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. The Senate consists of seven members, three of whom are elected annually, and the Chamber of Deputies of fourteen members, one half of whom are elected annually. The executive authority rests with a President, elected for four years.

There have been no regular elections of Presidents in

recent years, and no President has served the full term of his office. The predecessor of Don Crecencio Gomez, Don Ponciano Leiva, succeeded Don Celeo Arias, elected 1872, who, in consequence of an invasion of the republic by the troops of San Salvador, fled from the capital and was deprived of power February, 1874. The same troops deposed, in a preceding invasion, May, 1872, General Medina, predecessor of Don Celeo Arias, elected President in 1870.

The administration of the republic is carried on by a Council of State, composed of two ministers appointed by the President, one senator elected by both houses of Congress, and the judge of the Supreme Court. The resources of the country are rich, but are almost entirely undeveloped.

South of Honduras and east of Guatemala is —

3. *The Republic of San Salvador.* — It was erected into an independent state in 1853, when it dissolved its federative union with the other states of Central America. It has five provinces, a population of four hundred and fifty thousand, an area of nine thousand six hundred square miles, and is governed nominally under a constitution proclaimed March, 1864. The constitution, which has undergone frequent alterations through internecine wars, vests the legislative power in a Congress of two houses, the Senate, composed of twelve, and the House of Representatives, composed of twenty-four members. The executive is in the hands of a President, originally elected for six years, but whose tenure of office was in 1867 limited to four years.

The regular election of the President has in recent years been constantly superseded by *pronunciamentos* and mili-

tary nominations. The administrative affairs of the republic are carried on, under the President, by a ministry of two members, the first being head of the united departments of the Interior, War, and Finance, and the second of the departments of Foreign Affairs and Public Instruction.

The native population of San Salvador incline more to civilized pursuits than the natives of any neighboring state. The people are largely engaged in agriculture, in various branches of manufacture, and to some extent in mining.

4. *The Republic of Nicaragua* is the next south, and comprises six provinces, an area of nearly sixty thousand square miles, with a population of three hundred and fifty thousand. The constitution of the republic was proclaimed August 19, 1858. It vests the legislative power in a Congress of two houses, the upper, called the Senate, comprising ten members, and the lower, called the House of Representatives, having eleven members. Both branches are elected by universal suffrage, the members of the House of Representatives for the term of four, and those of the Senate for the term of six years. The executive power is with a President elected for four years, who exercises his authority through a council of ministers, controlling the four departments of Finance, Foreign Affairs, Public Instruction, and War and Marine.

South of Nicaragua is —

5. *The Republic of Costa Rica.* — It has an area a little less than twenty thousand square miles, with an estimated population of one hundred and ninety thousand. It has been an independent state since the year 1821, and is governed under a constitution bearing date December 22, 1871.

By its terms the legislative power is vested in a Congress of one chamber, called the "Congreso Constitucional," chosen in electoral assemblies by universal suffrage, and elected for the term of four years, one half retiring every two years. The executive authority is in the hands of a President, elected, in the same manner as the Congress, for the term of four years. He is assisted in his functions by two Vice-Presidents, elected annually in May, by Congress, for the term of one year.

There have been constant changes in the executive in recent years, owing to civil wars and insurrections. But few Presidents have served the full term of office.

The administration is carried on, under the President, by four ministers, namely, of the Interior and Justice, of Public Instruction and Foreign Affairs, of Finance and Commerce, and of Public Works.

These five republics in many respects present a deplorable picture. There have been repeated, but unsuccessful, attempts to restore the former federal union of Central America. With a strong centralized form of government, and the spread of intelligence among the people, a republic of great wealth and influence might be erected in Central America. At present the population consists of a few whites, — who, owing to the unsettled condition of affairs, are on the decrease, — the offspring of whites and negroes, the offspring of whites and Indians, aboriginal natives, and a few negroes. Almost the entire population is ignorant, immoral, and superstitious.

These republics are also irretrievably bankrupt. Guatemala has a debt of nearly nine hundred thousand dollars.

Honduras has a debt of upwards of seven millions, San Salvador one of eighty-seven millions, Nicaragua one of two millions, and Costa Rica one of nearly four millions. These debts are bonded, and were contracted in London. The amount of floating debt cannot be ascertained. The bonds and interest were long since repudiated. The payment of the annual interest, if made, would greatly exceed the revenue of the states. The republics of Central America seemingly cannot long remain in their present condition.

CHAPTER IV.

THE REPUBLICS OF AMERICA (CONTINUED).

THE magnitude of Spanish conquests in America during the sixteenth century is one of the wonders of history. That Spain was able to master and hold, for three centuries, the extended territories of Mexico and Central America, is amply sufficient to establish the fact of her enterprise and might; yet these were only a part of her remarkable achievements.

I. SOUTH AMERICA. — In 1533, two brothers were contending with each other for the throne of the ancient Peruvian empire. Francisco Pizarro, a daring and ambitious Spaniard, who rose from the occupation of a swineherd, took advantage of that fraternal conflict, invaded the country, and achieved a conquest over much of the South American continent. From that date (1533) until the beginning of the present century, South America remained almost entirely a dependency of Spain and Portugal. Between 1810 and 1820 the different Spanish colonies, in South America as in Central America and Mexico, waged their wars for independence. The Spanish yoke was thrown off, and the different republics were formed. Brazil is at present the only monarchy on the South American

continent, and is as desirable a government to live under as is any one of the South American republics.[44]

1. *The Republic of Venezuela* is the most northerly, and was formed in 1830, by secession from the other members of the Free-state founded by Simon Bolivar within the limits of the Spanish colony of New Granada. The history of the republic is briefly this: The Spanish flag was cut down in 1811, and the tricolor hoisted. Miranda and Simon Bolivar, who was the ablest and most remarkable man in the history of the struggle which freed South America from the Spanish yoke, took the field at the head of the so-termed patriot army. These insurgents were successful for a year, but in 1812 the royalists were victorious. In 1813, Bolivar raised a new army, and assumed the title of Dictator and Liberator. At this juncture the royalists determined upon a "war of death," armed the negro slaves, and murdered the insurgent prisoners by the hundred. Bolivar thereupon retaliated, shooting eight hundred Spaniards in La Guayra and Caraccas. The patriots were defeated in 1814. Later, the struggles were renewed, and the year 1823 witnessed the triumphs of the patriots and the complete expulsion of the Spanish troops.

The charter of fundamental laws now in force, dating from 1830, and re-proclaimed, with alterations, on the 28th of March, 1864, is modelled after the constitution of the United States of America, but with considerably more independence secured to provincial and local governments. The provinces, or states, of the republic, twenty-one in number, three of them having territories attached, have each their own legislature and executive, as well as their

own budgets, and judiciary officers. The main purpose of their alliance is that of common defence.

The area of the republic is upward of four hundred thousand square miles, with a population of nearly two millions.

At the head of the central government is a President, elected for two years, who, aided by a Vice-President, exercises his functions through six ministers. The President has no veto power. The legislation for the whole republic is vested in a Congress of two houses, called the Senate and the House of Representatives, both composed of members deputed by the same bodies in the individual states. The President, Vice-President, and congresses of states, are elected by universal suffrage. Since 1847, the republic has suffered greatly from internal dissensions, leading to almost continuous civil war. The rival parties are the Federalists and Confederalists, the former desiring a strong central government, and the latter the greatest possible independence of the separate states. The republic has witnessed its greatest prosperity at those times when the President has exercised almost despotic, at least dictatorial, authority. There is a public debt of a hundred millions of dollars.

On the southwest of Venezuela is —

2. *The Republic of Colombia*, officially styled the United States of Colombia. It was formed, under the Convention of Bogota, 1861, by the representatives of nine states which were previously a part of New Granada. The most important of the nine states of Colombia, the state of Panama, comprises the whole isthmus of that name, known historically as the Isthmus of Darien. In 1869, a treaty was concluded between Colombia and the United States of

America, which gave to the latter the exclusive right to construct an inter-oceanic canal across the Isthmus, at any point which may be selected by the United States.

The area of the republic is estimated at upwards of five hundred thousand square miles, a little more than one half of which is north, and the remainder south, of the equator. According to a rough enumeration taken in 1871, the population was reckoned at nearly three millions.

A constitution, bearing date May 8, 1863, vests the executive authority in a President, elected for two years, while the legislative power rests with a Congress of two houses, called the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Senate, numbering twenty-seven members, is composed of representatives of the nine states, each deputing three senators; the House of Representatives, numbering sixty-six members, is elected by universal suffrage, each state being a constituency, and returning one member for fifty thousand inhabitants, and a second for every additional twenty thousand. Besides this central government, each state has its own legislature and chief executive officer, the latter called Governor in all except Panama, where he bears the title of President. The President of Colombia has at his side a Vice-President, acting as chairman of the Senate, and his executive functions are exercised through four ministers, or secretaries, responsible to Congress. The first head of the executive government of Colombia, after its establishment as a federative republic, was General Thomas Mosquera, who acted as Dictator from September 20, 1861, until the proclamation of the constitution of 1863, under which Don Manuel Murillo Toro was elected President for two years, commencing April 1,

1864. General Mosquera was next chosen President, but before his term of office had expired he came into conflict with Congress, and on the 23d of May was deposed and imprisoned, his place being filled provisionally by the Vice-President, General Santos Gutierrez, who was subsequently elected President for the next term. From 1872 to 1875, the executive underwent constant changes in consequence of uninterrupted civil warfare.

The public debt was reported at upwards of fifty-three millions in 1877, three-fourths of which was due to British creditors, who hold as security on mortgage the chief source of revenue of the republic — that derived from the customs. The interior debt was estimated at over twenty millions.

The two contending parties are the Federalists and the Liberalists, with an apparent gain of late years among the Liberalists.

South of Colombia is —

3. *The Republic of Ecuador.* — This republic embraces a part of the territory ruled anciently by the Quitus, a civilized race kindred in many respects to the Quichuas or Incas of Peru. The valley of Quito, with those of Mexico and Cuzco, was one of the earliest seats of American civilization. The republic of Ecuador was constituted May 11, 1830, in consequence of a civil war which separated the members of the Central American Free-state, founded by Bolivar upon the ruins of the Spanish kingdom of New Granada. There are ten states with an area of nearly two hundred and fifty thousand square miles, and a population of something over a million. Not included in this estimate are the Galapagos, or Tortoise Islands, with an area of

nearly three thousand square miles, now mostly deserted, which belong to Ecuador. The capital of the republic, Quito, has an estimated population of eighty thousand.

By the constitution of Ecuador, dated March 31, 1843, the executive is vested in a President, elected for the term of four years, while the legislative power is given to a Congress of two houses, the first consisting of eighteen senators and the second of thirty deputies, both elected by universal suffrage. The Congress must assemble on the 15th of September of every year at Quito, without being summoned by the government. The nomination of the President takes place, in an indirect manner, by nine hundred electors, returned by the people for that purpose. The electors, together with the President, appoint a Vice-President, who, in certain cases, may be called upon by Congress to succeed the President before his term of office ends. The Vice-President also fills the position of Minister of the Interior.

Don José de Veintemilla was elected President September 8, 1876, and was appointed Dictator, for an unlimited period, by a convention, July 10, 1878. The President exercises his functions through a cabinet of three ministers, who, together with himself and the Vice-President, are responsible, individually and collectively, to Congress. There is no power of veto with the President, nor can he dissolve, shorten, or prorogue the sittings of Congress. By the terms of the constitution, no citizen can enjoy titular or other distinctions. No hereditary rights or privileges of rank and race are allowed to exist within the territory of the republic.

There is a public debt of nearly seventeen millions.

The Republic of Ecuador is thoroughly Roman Catholic.

The public services of no other religion are allowed. Education is entirely in the hands of the priests. Conflicts between the church and the liberal parties, insurrections, revolutions, and wars with sister republics, during late years, have made it necessary to convert the President into a Dictator.

Bounding Ecuador upon the south is—

4. *The Republic of Peru.* — When Peru was discovered by the Spaniards, early in the sixteenth century, it was occupied by two races, comparatively civilized and of common origin, the Quichuas and the Aymarás. The population at that time has been estimated as high as thirty millions. The history of the yet earlier inhabitants is not written, except in the ruins of massive blocks of cut stone, pyramidal structures of vast proportions, fragments of immense stone bridges and aqueducts of more than a hundred miles length, and paved roads, one of which can be traced from Cuzco to Quito, a distance of a thousand miles.

After the conquest by Francisco Pizarro and Diego Almagro, the country was in a state of constant anarchy, growing out of the insurrections of the natives and civil wars between the conquerors themselves. A vice-royalty was at length established, under which the country was governed until 1821. During that period, Peru was made the chief seat of the Spanish Transatlantic Empire. Lima, the capital, attained such splendor, that it was styled "the City of the Kings." In 1820, San Martin, of Chili, came at the head of an invading army, and a year later proclaimed himself Protector of Peru. At the request of San Martin, Simon Bolivar entered Peru, and in 1822 took possession of Lima. He was appointed Dictator, and at the

head of a Colombian and Peruvian army defeated the Spaniards, first at Junin, and later, with signal success, at Ayacucho. In 1836, the Peru-Bolivian Confederation was formed, under the presidency of a Bolivian, Santa Cruz, but was overthrown in 1839. A succession of civil wars and constitutional changes followed, during a period of nearly thirty years. The present constitution, proclaimed August 31, 1867, is modelled after that of the United States of America, the legislative power being vested in a Senate and a House of Representatives, the former composed of deputies of the provinces, two for each, and the latter of representatives nominated by the electoral colleges of provinces and parishes, at the rate of one member for every twenty thousand inhabitants. The parochial electoral colleges choose deputies to the provincial colleges, who in turn send representatives to Congress. In the session of 1876, the Senate was composed of forty-four members, and the House of Representatives of one hundred and ten members. The executive power is vested in a President, assisted by a Vice-President, both elected by the people for the term of four years. The President exercises his functions through a cabinet of five ministers, holding office at his pleasure. The departments are those of Foreign Affairs, of the Interior, of Justice, of Finance and Commerce, and of War and the Navy.

By the terms of the constitution, there exists absolute political, but not religious freedom, the charter prohibiting the public exercise of any other religion than the Roman Catholic, which is declared to be the religion of the state.

The republic is divided into twenty-one states, with an area of over five hundred thousand square miles, and a

population, according to a census taken in 1876, of upwards of two and a half millions. It is estimated that fifty-seven per cent. of the population of Peru are aborigines, and twenty-three per cent. belong to mixed races, "Cholos" and "Zambos." The remaining twenty per cent. are divided among descendants of Spaniards, Negroes, Chinese, and Europeans, the latter forming barely two per cent. of the total population, comprising chiefly Italians and Germans. At the enumeration of 1876, the population of the capital, Lima, was returned at one hundred and sixty thousand.

There is a bonded debt of fifty millions, with a floating debt of unknown amount. Frequent wars, civil insurrections, changes of constitution, assassinations of political leaders, bankruptcy, financial prostration, and Roman Catholic domination, are the blight of the Peruvian Republic.

5. *The Republic of Bolivia.* — The territory now occupied by this republic formed, until 1825, the southern province of Peru. At that date it was organized into a separate republic by Bolivar. The constitution drawn up by this liberator underwent important modifications in 1828, 1831, and 1863. There are eleven states in the republic, having an area of nearly eight hundred and fifty thousand square miles, and a population closely approximating two millions. The Indian population has been estimated as high as seven hundred thousand. The republic has but one seaport, the town of Cobija-Puerto, on the Pacific. Till within the last few years, the vast agricultural and mineral resources of the country were entirely dormant, for want of means of communication. The seat of the government, formerly at

the city of La Paz, capital of the republic, was transferred in 1869 to the fortified town of Oruro.

About one-half of the public revenue is derived from a land tax, which the aboriginal, or Indian, population is forced to pay, and the rest from import and export duties, and the proceeds of mines and other state property. Direct taxes do not exist. The public debt, internal and foreign, was estimated in June, 1879, at thirty millions.

By the provisions of the present constitution, the executive power is vested in a President, elected for a term of four years; while the legislative authority rests with a Congress of two chambers, called the Senate and the House of Representatives, both elected by universal suffrage. The President is assisted by a President of the Council, or Vice-President, appointed by himself, and a ministry, divided into four departments: of the Interior and Foreign Affairs, of Finance and Industry, of War, and of Justice and Public Worship. The fundamental law of the republic, ordering the election of a President every four years, has seldom been complied with since the presidency of Grand Marshal Santa Cruz, who ruled Bolivia from May, 1828, till his death, January 20, 1839. Subsequently, the supreme power has almost invariably been seized by some successful commander, who, proclaimed President by the troops, instead of chosen by the people, has been compelled to protect his office by an armed force against insurrections and military rivals. From 1867 to 1870 there was an almost uninterrupted civil war, which reached its height in 1869, when General Malgarejo for a time assumed the government, after an unsuccessful attempt at insurrection by a rival candidate, General Belzu, head of the government from

March 22 to his execution, March 27, 1869. The next President was General Ballivian, who died February 14, 1874, and was succeeded by Dr. Thomas Frias, head of the government till the outbreak of a new insurrection, May 4, 1876, at which time he was deposed by the troops, and General Daza became Dictator.

Southeast of Bolivia is —

6. *The Republic of Paraguay.* — This territory was discovered by Sebastian Cabot, late in 1526, while seeking a more direct route to Peru. It was then quite thickly settled by the Payagua Indians. In 1536, an expedition ascended the Paraguay River and established a settlement at Asuncion, which has continued to the present time. The first European ruler was Martinez de Grala, who governed with great energy and courage, made himself respected by the Indians, encouraged his men to marry native women, and then compelled them to respect their marital vows. The result was a very rapid increase of population. In 1610, the Jesuits established mission-stations at all important points, and succeeded in gaining control of most of the Guarani Indians. The Jesuits learned the native language, and then jealously guarded the country from all intrusion, being armed by a royal order from Spain, forbidding even Spaniards to visit the state without permission. In 1767, the Jesuits became such intolerable nuisances that they were expelled from the Spanish colonies of South America, including Paraguay. Their splendid churches and palatial residences thereupon fell into other hands. The republic of Paraguay gained its independence from Spanish rule in 1811, and after a short government by two consuls, the supreme power was seized, in 1815, by Dr. José Gaspar

Rodriguez Francia, who exercised autocratic sway as Dictator, till his death, September 20, 1840.

"The country being accessible only by way of the river, he stopped all ingress and egress, allowing, during all this time, only some half dozen foreigners to leave the country, and none to enter it. The shipping then in the river stayed there, rotted, and fell to pieces. He died in the year 1840, and as for nearly thirty years no freedom of expression or thought had been permitted, and the better class of people had generally been destroyed, the nation, at the time of his death, was left not only without a government, but without its forms. The will of Francia had so long been the supreme law, that when he died there was no authority left, no one to give an order, and no one to execute it if given. The soldiers, who had obeyed Francia implicitly, recognized no other ruler, and were glad to disappear from sight." As might be expected, Dr. Francia's reign was followed by a state of anarchy, which lasted till 1842, when a National Congress, meeting at the capital of Asuncion, elected two nephews of the Dictator, Don Alonso and Don Carlos Antonio Lopez, joint consuls of the republic. Another Congress, March 13, 1844, voted a new constitution, and, March 14, elected Don Carlos Antonio Lopez sole President, with dictatorial powers, which were continued by another election, March 14, 1857. At the death of Don Carlos, September 10, 1862, his son, Don Francisco Solano Lopez, succeeded to the supreme power, by testamentary order, without opposition. President Lopez, in 1865, began a dispute with the government of Brazil, the consequence of which was the invasion of the republic, in 1865, by a Brazilian army, united with forces of the

Argentine Confederation and Uruguay. After a struggle of five years, Lopez was defeated and killed in the battle of Aquidaban, 1870. A Congress, meeting at Asuncion in June, 1870, voted a new constitution, which was publicly proclaimed November 25th of the same year. The constitution is modelled closely on that of the Argentine Confederation, the legislative authority being vested in a Congress of two Houses, a Senate and a House of Deputies, and the executive being intrusted to a President, elected for the term of six years, with a non-active Vice-President at his side. The President exercises his authority through a Cabinet of five Ministers, who preside over the departments of the Interior, of Finance, of Worship and Public Instruction, of War and Navy, and of Foreign Affairs.

The area of the republic, prior to 1870, was claimed to be over a hundred thousand square miles. But the new boundaries imposed by the conquerors in the war of 1865–70, reduced the area to a little upward of fifty-seven thousand square miles. The present estimated population is nearly two hundred and fifty thousand. About one-third of the inhabitants are living in the central province, the rest being scattered as settlers over the remaining portion of cultivated country. Nearly three-fourths of the entire territory are national property. The republic is hopelessly and irretrievably insolvent.

Next south is —

7. *The Argentine Republic.* — Sebastian Cabot, in 1530, explored the river La Plata in the interest of Spain, and in 1580 Garay, another enterprising Spaniard, founded the city of Buenos Ayres. The early colonies of this part of South America were attached at first to the vice-royalty of Peru.

The Argentine provinces freed themselves from the Spanish yoke in 1810, but were immediately embroiled in disputes and contentions among themselves. The first hastily-formed union continued but one year, being dissolved in 1827. In 1835 Rosas became Captain-general of the confederacy, and with an iron hand crushed anarchy and for a time restored peace. Foreign complications brought an Anglo-French fleet against Rosas, who suffered loss but was not defeated. Brazil, Uruguay, and Paraguay next waged war against him, and in 1851, upon the plains of Moron, he was utterly defeated. Since that date insurrection and anarchy, often secretly encouraged by neighboring states, have prevailed.

The present constitution bears date May 15, 1853. There are fourteen states, with an area of five hundred and fifteen thousand seven hundred square miles, having a population of nearly two millions. Not quite one in seventy is able to read and write. The capital of the confederation, Buenos Ayres, has a population of a few less than two hundred thousand. The immigrants, the great majority of whom are natives of Italy and Spain, numbered, in 1877, twenty-eight thousand seven hundred and eight, and in 1878 they numbered thirty-five thousand eight hundred and seventy-six.

The bonded debt of the confederacy amounts to sixty-five millions, with a floating debt of twenty millions. Besides this, each state is groaning under heavy taxation and is deeply involved in bankruptcy.

By the provisions of the present constitution the executive power is vested in a President, elected for six years by representatives of the fourteen provinces, one hundred and

thirty-three in number. The legislative authority is vested in a National Congress, consisting of a Senate and a House of Deputies, the former numbering twenty-eight, two from each state, and the latter numbering fifty members. A Vice-President, elected in the same manner and at the same time as the President, is chairman of the Senate, but has otherwise no political power. The President is commander-in-chief of the troops, and appoints to all civil, military, and judicial offices.

The ministry, appointed by and acting under the orders of the President, is divided into five departments, namely, of the Interior, Foreign Affairs, Finance, War, and Education.

The governors of the various provinces are invested with very extensive powers, and to a certain degree are independent of the central executive.

East of the Argentine Republic is —

8. *The Republic of Uruguay.* — The first European settlement in that section of South America was made by Spanish Jesuits in 1622. Later colonies were formed by both Spaniards and Portuguese. For nearly two centuries the state was a subject of almost constant contention between Brazil and Buenos Ayres. In 1828, by the mediation of England, the northern part, known as the Seven Missions, was ceded to Brazil, and the southern part was erected into the Republic of Uruguay.

Her present constitution was proclaimed July 18, 1831. By its terms the legislative power is vested in a parliament composed of two houses, the Senate and the Chamber of Representatives, which meet in annual session, extending from February 15 to the end of June. In the interval of

the session, a permanent committee of two senators and five members of the Lower House assume the legislative power, as well as the general control of the administration.

The executive is given by the constitution to the President of the republic, elected for a term of four years. A Vice-President, also elected for four years, is at the head of the Senate, but has no other political power.

Colonel L. Latorre, formerly Minister of War and Marine, was, March 18, 1876, elected President, with dictatorial powers.

The President is assisted in his executive duties by a council of ministers who manage the departments of the Interior, of Foreign Affairs, of Finance, of War and Marine. The area of Uruguay is estimated at nearly seventy-five thousand square miles, with a population numbering four hundred and fifty thousand, according to the calculation of M. Vaillant, registrar-general, published in 1873. The country is divided into thirteen states. The capital, Montevideo, has, according to a rough enumeration, a population of a few over one hundred thousand, of whom about one third are foreigners. Immigration reached the highest number in 1870, when there were upwards of twenty thousand.

The debt of Uruguay, in view of its limited available resources, is enormous, being not far from fifty millions. The notes of the circulating banks are under state guaranty, with forced currency. Paper money is constantly on the increase in amount, but is constantly decreasing in its purchasing power.

Uruguay during the period of her freedom has been a constant sufferer. The unsettled state of the national char-

acter, the conflicts between the conservatism of the old Spanish and Roman Catholic ideas, on the one hand, and the wild radicalism of ambitious political adventurers on the other, have kept the state in a high fever, and have enabled those who were disposed grossly to victimize the people.

A long, narrow tract, bounded east by the Andes and west by the Pacific ocean, extending from latitude 24° to 43°, is the territory embraced by —

9. *The Republic of Chili.* — At the time of Pizarro's conquests, Chili formed a part of the dominion of the Peruvian empire. In 1535 Almagro and Valdivia, successors of Pizarro, invaded the country, and conquered all the inhabitants except the Araucanians, whom the Spaniards were never successful in bringing into subjection. In 1810 the Chilians revolted against the king of Spain, and a junta, which met at Santiago, elected the Marquis de la Plate, a native Chilian, President of the republic. In 1818 the independence of Chili was formally proclaimed by Bernerdo O'Higgins, the commander-in-chief of the Chilian patriots.

The constitution, voted by the representatives of the nation in 1833, establishes three departments of state — the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. The legislative power is vested in two assemblies, called the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. The Senate is composed of twenty members, elected for the term of nine years. The Chamber of Deputies, chosen for a period of three years, consists of one representative for every twenty thousand of the population. The executive is exercised by a President, elected for a term of five years.

The President is chosen by indirect election. The people,

in the first instance, nominate their delegates by ballot, and the latter, in their turn, appoint the chief executive of the state. The President is assisted by a Council of State, and a cabinet, divided into five departments. The Council of State, appointed by the President of the republic, consists of the ministers, two judges, one ecclesiastical dignitary, one general or admiral, and five other members.

Chili is divided into sixteen states, of which the aggregate area is one hundred and thirty thousand square miles, containing in 1875 a population exceeding two millions.

Not included in the above estimate are three new provinces, or settlements, — the province of Biobio, the territory of Angol, and the settlement of Arauco, — formed subsequently to the last census, by a law of October 13, 1875. The number of inhabitants of these districts is returned at two hundred and fifteen thousand. The land of the Araucanians, a vast district on the southern frontier, claimed by the republic, is calculated to embrace one hundred and twenty thousand square miles, with a population of seventy thousand.

While Roman Catholicism is the prevailing creed, other religions are protected by laws lately passed. Chili is politically the least democratic state in the Western hemisphere. In order to vote for a deputy, one must possess either five hundred dollars in real, or one thousand dollars in personal property, and nearly twice as much to vote for a senator. In Santiago and Valparaiso, where wealth is greater, the qualifying amount needs to be doubled. In 1818 unsuccessful attempts were made to abolish or modify these restrictions upon suffrage. The country has succeeded so well under the prevailing system that any

change, it was argued, would be attended with more or less peril.

No republic in South America is watched at present with more interest than Chili. In her late brilliant victories over Peru and Bolivia, she has distinguished herself by a courage, dash, and energy very unusual with the South American republics. Indeed, ever since achieving her independence, seventy years ago, she has been noted for the intelligent and judicious administration of her affairs, compared with the governments by which she is surrounded. She has enjoyed a degree of peace and prosperity which the other commonwealths of South America have not known. The republic is suffering, however, from heavy indebtedness. Her foreign and internal debt in September, 1878, amounted to nearly seventy millions, and subsequently there were large issues of paper money, of unknown amount, to defray expenditure for the army.

Between the conservative, or Roman Catholic, on the one hand, and the liberal, or democratic parties, who are contending for universal suffrage and perfect religious toleration, on the other, arise bitter hostilities whenever the republic is at peace with her neighboring sister republics.[45]

This survey of the South American republics cannot well be concluded without a few passing observations. And first, since it is impossible for these republics ever to pay the full face of their indebtedness, the sooner they scale down, pay what they can, and then forever repudiate the balance, the better. Until this is done, the people, for the greater part, will remain embarrassed, thriftless, and demoralized.

It likewise seems a matter of regret that some man is not found mighty enough to step forward and wipe out all existing state governments, and organize a strong central power which would be able to administer the affairs of the entire continent. South America needs not state or sectional rights, but national unity and might. She is precisely where the jealous powers of Europe have greatly desired to see the United States, and precisely where the United States would be were state rights and secession views to prevail.

Again, every student of our national welfare must also regard it a great mistake that in 1826 the United States refused to take part in the Panama congress. By that unfortunate refusal, in the words of an eminent publicist, "the new states were removed from the sympathetic and protecting influence of our example, and their commerce, which we might then have secured, passed into other hands unfriendly to the United States."

Though in a crippled condition, these South American republics exported to Great Britain, in 1878, two hundred million dollars' worth of their commodities, and imported from Great Britain nearly seventy millions of her commodities. There is no good reason why the United States should not have had the benefit of this trade, nor why her ships should not have been the carriers; — no reason except that our Congress is so engaged with party machinery that no time is left for important legislation.

The most hopeful feature in the South American republics is that Roman Catholicism is losing its iron grip upon them. Recent legislation, in almost every instance, tends towards religious toleration, and Protestant missions and

schools, under missionaries and teachers from the United States, are established in nearly every republic.

All things considered, every friend of republican institutions may well wish for such improved conditions, and such a noble and intelligent population in South America, as will hasten the day when a united, consolidated, and grand republic, a rival of our own, shall absorb into itself Brazil, the only empire in the Western hemisphere, and extend itself from the Isthmus of Panama to Cape Horn. But if the conditions and populations are not what they should be, then, better one government, and that — the Brazilian empire.

II. Republics of Hayti and San Domingo. — Among the group of West India Islands is Hayti. It was discovered by Columbus in 1492, and soon after was filled with adventurous European settlers who were in search of sudden wealth. When the island was discovered, its inhabitants were supposed to number not less than two millions. Subsequently the Spaniards governed the island in a manner so cruel and barbarous as to result in frequent rebellions. At length the island was almost completely depopulated. Later (1630), the French recolonized the western portion. Later, the free colored population, in many instances possessed of great wealth, being denied all political rights, rebelled, and after various bloody struggles, gained, in 1791, the rights of franchise.

The negro slaves subsequently rose in rebellion. They were successful, and in 1793 all the inhabitants of the island were declared free and equal. Then followed the brilliant military career and administration of the negro patriot,

Toussaint l'Ouverture. The French government can never recover from the guilt involved in its treachery and treatment of Toussaint after his capture.

Hayti has had a varying fortune from the time of Toussaint to the present. She has been successively under French, English, and Spanish domination. She has been twice declared an empire; she has often been under rival chiefs, and has at three different times (1804, 1825, and 1858) declared her independence. At present the island contains the two republics above mentioned.

1. *San Domingo.* — This republic, founded in 1844, is situated upon the eastern part of the island of Hayti, is divided into five states, embraces nearly twenty thousand square miles, and has a population of two hundred and fifty thousand. The inhabitants of San Domingo, like their neighbors, the Haytians, are composed mainly of negroes and mulattoes, though the European-descended inhabitants are quite numerous, and through their influence, the Spanish is the prevailing speech.

The Bay of Samaná, on the northeast coast, one of the largest natural harbors in the world, thirty miles long and ten miles broad, was ceded, with the surrounding country, to a company formed in the United States, by a treaty signed by the President of the republic, January 10, 1873. Under another decree, passed March 25, 1874, the rights of the company, on the ground of non-payment of a stipulated annual rent, were confiscated.

There is a national debt exceeding three and a half millions, contracted in London, though only about two hundred and fifty thousand dollars were ever received by the republic.

San Domingo is governed under a constitution bearing date November 18, 1844, re-proclaimed, with changes, November 14, 1865, after a revolution which expelled the troops of Spain, that had held possession of the country for the two previous years. By the terms of the constitution the legislative power is vested in a national Congress of two houses, called the Consego conservador, and the Tribunado, the first consisting of twelve, and the second of fifteen members. The members of both houses are chosen for a term of four years by indirect election, with restricted suffrage. The powers of the National Congress are confined to the general affairs of the republic. The individual states have separate legislatures.

The executive of the republic is vested in a President, chosen by indirect election for a term of four years. Constant insurrections have allowed very few Presidents to serve the full term of office. Don Ignacio Gonzales, April 12, 1878, was proclaimed President, with dictatorial powers. He was succeeded by Baez, who at last accounts had surrendered and resigned.

The administrative affairs of the republic are in charge of a ministry appointed by the President, with the approval of the Consego conservador. The ministry is composed of the heads of the departments of the Interior and Police, Finance, Justice, War and Marine, and Foreign Affairs.

2. *Hayti.* — This republic, formerly a French colony, is situated upon the western part of the island of Hayti, embraces an area of a trifle over ten thousand square miles, is divided into four states, and has, according to the calculation of the best authorities, a population numbering five hundred and seventy thousand, though, according to late

official estimates, there is a population of eight hundred thousand. There are only a few Europeans; the mass of the population are negroes and French-speaking mulattoes.

The republic is governed under a constitution proclaimed June 14, 1867. By its terms the legislative power rests in a National Assembly, divided into two chambers, respectively called the Senate and the House of Commons. The members of the House are elected by the direct vote of all male citizens for the term of three years. The members of the Senate are nominated for two years by the House of Commons from a list presented by the electoral college. The executive power is in the hands of a President, who, according to the constitution, must be elected by the people, but in recent years has generally been chosen by the united Senate and House of Commons, sitting in National Assembly, and in some instances by the troops, and by delegates of parties acting as representatives of the people. The nominal term of office of the President is four years, but it is generally cut short by insurrections. The administration of the republic is carried on, under the President, by ministers who stand at the head of four departments.

There is a large floating debt, consisting chiefly of paper money issued by successive governments, the great mass of which is enormously depreciated by frequent repudiation and by forgery. There is also a foreign debt, consisting of a loan of nearly twelve million francs, contracted at Paris in 1825, and of other liabilities incurred towards France, the total amounting to upwards of thirty million francs. No interest has for years been paid on this debt. Nevertheless, the government issued, in Paris, June, 1875, with partial success, a new foreign loan of eighty-three and a

half million francs, the two avowed objects being the extinguishment of the old debt, both home and foreign, and the construction of railways.

The political condition of the entire group of the West India islands at present is not hopeful. Spain has only a questionable hold upon Cuba. The two republics, San Domingo and Hayti, have an extremely doubtful prospect. A glance at the map is all that is necessary to show, from either a commercial, political, or military point of view, that the power which rules the West Indies should not be England, France, Spain, Central America, or South America, but should be the power which rules the territories now called the United States of America.

IV.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

CHAPTER I.

NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

The limits and design of this treatise forbid entering minutely into the early history of the United States. The original European settlers in New England, like the founders of the Israelitish, Carthaginian, Venetian, and Icelandic republics, sought refuge from civil and religious oppression and persecution. Like most other republics, the United States gained their independence not easily, but through heroic suffering and generous bloodshed. The form of government adopted has thus far proved successful and beneficent. But whether it is to continue, is a serious question in the minds of some of the most thoughtful and patriotic citizens of the republic. At present no one, perhaps, should sympathize with the American-born citizen who, amid occasional hard times and political strifes, asserts that he would be glad to see the republican institutions of the United States supplanted by a monarchy or a dictatorship. Such statements spring from the occasional piques and irritations of those who hardly realize what is involved in great national changes and revolutions.

But no thoughtful citizen, familiar with history, and cognizant of present tendencies in the United States, is without grave apprehensions. Nor can any one be condemned if,

at times, the conviction is felt that the day may come, and may not be very distant, when those who have property to protect and families to defend will be left, amid certain possible emergencies and contingencies, to admit that the guardian power of the republic can no longer be relied upon. As patriotic hearts as beat in America are apprehensive that the time is coming when a dictatorship, or an imperial government, shall be welcomed as a choice between evils; in that day, the expressed preference for a limited monarchy would not be treasonable, but would be, in the truest sense, patriotic.

The soundness of this statement will appear if the nature of government, and the purposes for which it is instituted, are carefully considered. That is, whatever may be the form of state administration, whether monarchic, aristocratic, or democratic, its existence can be justified only as it secures or contributes to the following ends:

First. The defence of person and property.

Second. The administration of justice.

Third. The development of society.

These are regarded as the fundamental aims of government, and they rest upon another still deeper fundamental principle, namely, that the ultimate object of government is to secure the greatest good to the greatest number.

Only a moment's reflection is necessary to convince any thoughtful person that a form of government which secures the greatest good to one people may not secure it to another; indeed, a type of government which is best for one generation may not, even in that same country, be best for another and different generation. The form of government which is most desirable in the British Isles, for instance, may

not be the most desirable for the aborigines of America. The form of government which was best in the United States when Puritanism prevailed may not be best when the state is crowded with hastily-naturalized and ignorant foreigners.

The existing mountain republics of Europe, though small, are strong and orderly; those in Central and South America are weak and turbulent. But could the mountaineers of Switzerland, and the inhabitants of San Marino or Andorra, be transported to San Salvador or Bolivia, there would be orderly, where there are now disorderly, republics.

In a word, it is the character of the people that is to decide which, in a given instance, is the best form of government. It is only when the *will* of the multitude is most likely to secure the greatest good to the greatest number, that a democracy is better, for that age at least, than a monarchy. Hence when the *will* of a monarch or dictator is more likely to secure the greatest good to the greatest number, then a monarchy or a dictatorship is better, for that age at least, than an aristocracy or a democracy.

There is no occasion for surprise, therefore, that a day came in the history of nearly every extinct republic, when patriotic and law-abiding citizens asked for a *ruler*, whether dictator or despot they cared not, provided he had ability to command and to wield power sufficient to bring order out of confusion. No lesson in history is more fully or clearly taught than that a republic is good for nothing unless the people have right-mindedness. There have been, and perhaps are to-day, conditions of citizenship in the United States which render our federal and representative form of government the most desirable possible. But it is equally true that a quarter or a half century hence, indeed, within

either of those periods, there may be such a condition of citizenship that our federal compact will be the least desirable possible, less desirable than the centralization of France, less desirable than the limited monarchy of Great Britain, less desirable even than the comparatively absolute monarchies of Russia and Turkey. What was best yesterday may not be best to-day; what is best to-day may not be best to-morrow, are political postulates from which there is no easy escape.

Now, uniting the foregoing principles with a fundamental law found everywhere in the universe, that there is a strong tendency towards what is fit and best, we are forced to take the unpleasant position that forms of government so strongly sympathize with the character of the people governed, and the character and conditions of the people of almost every nationality are so fluctuating, that change, rather than permanency, must be the rule with all human institutions and governments. "Every age," as Heine forcibly remarks, "is a sphinx, which sinks into the earth as soon as its problem is solved." The nature of government, and the survey of extinct republics already presented, cannot fail, therefore, to suggest that some dark fatality may be impending over the United States of America.

CHAPTER II.

SUPPOSED SECURITIES.

It is often asserted that there are certain provisions against the overthrow of the United States government, which did not exist in the extinct republics of ancient and medieval date.

For instance, the magnificent extent of our domains, stretching from one ocean to another, and from the Great Lakes to the Mexican Gulf, have been expatiated upon by popular orators for the last half century. But a moment's reflection ought to establish the conviction that extent of territory is not a permanent barrier against the internal perils that threaten the existence of our national government. Indeed, since extent of territory is attended by conflicting state or national interests, there is, in proportion to extent of territory, a corresponding national danger. The historic facts are, that those republics which have the longest history, also have had the most limited territory. San Marino, Andorra, some of the Italian Communes, and the free cities of Germany, are notable examples. The wisest statesmen of the United States see, therefore, not safety, but a peril of no small magnitude, in the very fact that Maine is so far removed from California, and Oregon from Florida. A conflict of sectional interests is rendered

possible and even probable, except there shall be great individual forbearance.

Again, the marvellous prosperity of the republic is the pride of every patriot. The vast resources of the country are hardly touched. Of the triumphs of the mechanical industries too much cannot be said. In these matters we are far, very far in advance of all who have preceded us. Our means of intercommunication, the innumerable printing-presses of the country, the network of railways, the elegance of our palatial steamboats, the lines of telegraph, the telephone, and a multitude of other forms of material prosperity, are among the wonders of the age. Ancient republics hardly dreamed of these achievements, still no evidence can be presented that the extinct republics fell because they did not have what is enjoyed by us. These national aggrandizements are in no way national defences against the perils that threaten our national existence.

While ancient republics are not our equals in mechanical inventions, they very far outreach us in much else. In the ornamental arts we scarcely approach Greece, Rome, several of the cities of Italy, or the Netherlands. Ornamental art has as much patriotism in it as has mechanical invention. All history, as well as the nature of the case, warns us, therefore, against depending upon any of these material achievements or artistic accomplishments as securities against national overthrow. They are not of the slightest account. Rails of iron and wires of steel cannot bind together a government already having in it the elements of dissolution. All such bonds will be most easily snapped in sunder. In case of usurpation, these very triumphs of our civilization would but strengthen the cen-

tralization, and help wreck the republic. Unless material prosperity improves the moral quality of our citizenship, the country is not a whit safer than if our only means of transit between east and west were confined to stage-coach or horseback. Unless steamboats, railroads, telegraphs, and telephones aid in making men more temperate, more honest, and more pure, they should never be mentioned nor thought of in connection with the supposed permanency of the republic. The man who watches his flocks on the hill-side by day, and sleeps in a mountain hamlet at night, is as free from demoralizing temptations, and also is quite as likely to be a noble and valuable citizen, as is the man who rides in a palace steamboat. The citizen, not the steamboat, affords national security.

Again, general intelligence and an excellent system of public schools in the United States are thought by many to give our republic a marked advantage over all other republics, and to afford ample security against national subversion or overthrow. But, upon a close inspection, the facts bearing upon this subject are not of the most flattering character. In every state in the republic, the ballot is placed in the hands of men who can neither read nor write. The Southern States are, confessedly, in a most deplorable condition. Up to the close of the civil war, there was no free-school system in any slave-state. Indeed, the laws of those states positively forbade the majority of their people from learning even the rudiments of education. The slaves were freed, and those *lawless* laws, which imposed perpetual ignorance, were abrogated. The Freedmen's Bureau was established, but after rendering a needed and valuable service, the government, owing to one reason or another,

was induced to discontinue the Bureau, and thenceforth practically forsook those ignorant but liberated and enfranchised people. This cannot be looked upon in any other light, politically, than one of the greatest mistakes ever made by any free government, existing or historic.

According to the census of 1870, in the states of Mississippi and Texas ninety-six per cent. of the colored people were entirely illiterate. In another state, ninety-five per cent., in another ninety-three per cent., in two others ninety-one per cent., and in another ninety per cent. of the colored people were found unable to read, or write their names. Eighty-eight per cent. of the entire colored people of the South are in perfect ignorance.

By general consent, so far as intelligence is concerned, there is not much to choose between large masses of the whites in the Southern States and the colored people. Both classes are ignorant, yet both are exercising the highest functions of an American citizen. From a table of statistics recently furnished, it is found that the total average of non-attendance among those who are of the school-going age in the sixteen Southern States is seventy-five per cent. And one-half of this number are growing up to wield the ballot, and have a voice in deciding who shall rule over us. This dense illiteracy of the South, which contains more than one-third of the entire population of the nation, amounting to three million five hundred and fifty thousand four hundred and twenty-five persons who cannot read and write, is startling. But it is still more startling, that of the two million illiterate voters in the United States, one million seven hundred thousand are in the Southern States, which elect thirty-two of the seventy-

four senators and one hundred and nine of the two hundred and ninety-two representatives in Congress. And this in a country where "there are two things that can reach the top of the pyramid," as D'Alembert says, "the eagle and the reptile."

But for the prevailing ignorance of the southern white people, it is hardly probable that a few skilled leaders would have been able to take the seceding states out of the Union and into rebellion. Yet, incredible as it may seem, the national government has been doing comparatively nothing during these late years to protect itself at the very point whence our former misfortunes came, and where, also, to-day is to be found one of the most subtle, and one of the most dangerous, species of peril that has ever threatened any republican form of government.

Some of the middle or border states approach in illiteracy the condition of the extreme south. It is to be hoped that Kentucky does not fairly represent the range of states to which she belongs. One of the county-school commissioners of that state makes the following report:

"There are twenty-five or thirty schoolhouses in this county not as good as the average of good horse-stables. I am of the opinion that the people of this county, as a whole, are making greater efforts to raise pigs than to educate their children. I am satisfied that it costs more to maintain the dogs of the county than the people pay in support of the common schools."

But the southern and middle states are not alone in this illiterate condition. Our northern cities are fast filling with voters as ignorant as were the rabble hordes that helped wreck the republics of antiquity.

Eighteen or twenty thousand voters in every municipal election in New York cannot read or write; "and they are a make-weight sufficient, in the hands of a few astute and unscrupulous men, to determine the result of any ordinary political contest in that city."

A writer of wide reputation asks this pertinent question:

"Are you sure that when the population of Massachusetts is as dense as that of England, your Massachusetts laws will make everything smooth here? Has this commonwealth a right to be proud of its exemption from illiteracy? There are here sixteen hundred thousand people, and one hundred thousand of them are illiterates. Of one hundred thousand citizens in Massachusetts above ten years of age, and of seventy-seven thousand above twenty-one, it is true either that they cannot read, or that they cannot write."

When, therefore, all these matters are taken into account, are we sure of our great educational advantage over the republics of antiquity?

Macaulay, in criticising Dr. Johnson's views of the Athenian people, makes use of this language:

"There seems to be, on the contrary, every reason to believe that, in general intelligence, the Athenian populace far surpassed the lower orders of any community that has ever existed. It must be considered, that to be a citizen was to be a legislator — a soldier — a judge — one upon whose voice might depend the fate of the wealthiest tributary state, of the most eminent public man. The lowest offices, both of agriculture and of trade, were, in common, performed by slaves. The commonwealth supplied its meanest members with the support of life, the opportunity

of leisure, and the means of amusement. Books were indeed few: but they were excellent; and they were accurately known. It is not by turning over libraries, but by repeatedly perusing and intently contemplating a few great models, that the mind is best disciplined. Books, however, were the least part of the education of an Athenian citizen. Let us for a moment transport ourselves in thought to that glorious city. Let us imagine that we are entering its gates in the time of its power and glory. A crowd is assembled round a portico. All are gazing with delight at the entablature, for Phidias is putting up the frieze. We turn into another street; a rhapsodist is reciting there: men, women, children are thronging round him: the tears are running down their cheeks; their eyes are fixed; their very breath is still, for he is telling how Priam fell at the feet of Achilles, and kissed those hands — the terrible, the murderous — which had slain so many of his sons. We enter the public place; there is a ring of youths, all leaning forward, with sparkling eyes and gestures of expectation. Socrates is pitted against the famous atheist from Ionia, and has just brought him to a contradiction in terms. But we are interrupted. The herald is crying, 'Room for the Prytanes.' The general assembly is to meet. The people are swarming in on every side. Proclamation is made: 'Who wishes to speak?' There is a shout, and a clapping of hands; Pericles is mounting the stand. Then for a play of Sophocles; and away to sup with Aspasia. I know of no modern university which has so excellent a system of education."

But, for the sake of the argument, we will admit that general intelligence in the United States far surpasses that

of the voting citizens of Athens or of any other republic. Yet, does any one presume that such a degree, or indeed any degree, of intellectual attainment will save the republic? On the contrary, it will be found that mere intellectual training does not of necessity inspire patriotism nor reduce crime. The schoolroom may make a more crafty demagogue, without making a safer citizen.[46] Says a writer who has given much thought to these subjects:

"Culture, untouched by religion, has no redeeming power. Whenever culture of intellect outstrips the culture of conscience, disaster follows. Popular intelligence with popular unbelief ends in popular corruption."

Victor Cousin, the profoundest of French philosophers, in an address before the Chamber of Peers, maintained that "any system of school-training which sharpens and strengthens the intellectual powers without at the same time affording a source of restraint and counter-check to their tendency to evil, by supplying moral culture and religious principle, is a curse rather than a blessing."

"Despotism," says De Tocqueville, "may govern without religious faith, but liberty cannot."

Herbert Spencer is strictly philosophical when saying that "the belief in the moralizing effects of intellectual culture, flatly contradicted by facts, is absurd."

John Locke has wisely written thus:

"If virtue and a well-tempered soul be not got and settled so as to keep out ill and vicious habits, languages and science, and all the other accomplishments of education, will be to no purpose but to make the worse or more dangerous man."

Another distinguished thinker has remarked, with equal

truthfulness, that "to educate the mind of a bad man without correcting his morals, is to put a sword into the hands of a maniac."

Washington, in his farewell address, says: "Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

Daniel Webster, in his argument against the Girard will, said: "In what age, by what sect, where, when, by whom, has religious truth been excluded from the education of youth? Nowhere! — never! Everywhere and at all times it has been regarded as essential."

But the most enlightened states in the republic, ignoring all these principles of true culture and development, have allowed sectarian quarrels and personal indifference to hush or silence religious instruction. European nations who are thought inferior in their common-school system have, in certain respects, gone far in advance of us, by acting upon the principle, that to educate a moral being, while wholly ignoring and excluding moral influences, is preposterous. In England — a country more nearly like our own than any other — the new educational act of 1870 made careful provision for Biblical and religious instruction. With the exception of Birmingham, where the disorderly class is large, and a few small towns in Wales, every school board approved the act. Only a short time since, the London school board sent a circular to all the teachers, asking them to give more attention to religious instruction. It says: "The committee hope that during the Bible lesson the teachers will keep this object before them, and that

every opportunity will be used earnestly and sympathetically to bring home to the minds of the children those moral and religious principles on which the right conduct of their future lives must necessarily depend."

Huxley has recently spoken very decidedly in favor of the introduction of the Bible as a reading-book into common schools. His position is, that "there must be a moral substratum to a child's education to make it valuable;" and that "there is no other source from which this can be obtained at all comparable with the Bible."

De Tocqueville, after a visit to America, wrote these instructive words: "The United States must be religious in order to be free. Society must be destroyed unless the Christian moral tie be strengthened in proportion as the political tie is relaxed; and what can be done with a people who are their own masters, if they be not submissive to Deity? It cannot be doubted that in the United States the instruction of the people powerfully contributes to the support of the democratic republic; and such must always be the case, I believe, where the instruction which enlightens the understanding is not separated from the moral education which amends the heart."

The Prussians have a maxim, that "whatever you would have appear in a nation's life you must put into the public schools." The Prussian educational code obliges every inhabitant, unless he can satisfy the authorities that his children, when reaching five years of age, are obtaining an education of equal standard elsewhere, to send them to the *Volks-schule*. The instruction given in those schools is, therefore, the minimum standard for every Prussian. It consists of reading and writing German, the geography

and history of Prussia, arithmetic, drawing, music, gymnastics, and religious exercises.

In view, therefore, of what the wisest thinkers affirm, are we too severe when repeating the grave charge, that the common-school system, in some of the most enlightened states of our republic, has made so many compromises, its instructions are so reticent upon all religious subjects, the voice of prayer is so effectually hushed within its halls, the Bible is retained with so slight a tenure, and the irreligious thinking of not a few teachers employed is so extreme, that we have an educational system, such that upon graduation day the school is liable to present to the country simply more accomplished villains. The schoolboy of to-day may successfully outwit an ignorant policeman; he may be more subtle and less brutal, but he is no less criminal on that account, and is not one whit less perilous than are the most illiterate to the welfare of our American republic.

To a mind of special religious cast there is still another ground of supposed security against the overthrow of the republic of the United States, namely, divine interposition. There are very few thoughtful and religious people who are destitute of the conviction that God has wrought wondrously for the American people. In the settlement of the country, during the Revolution, and equally during the Rebellion, there is no difficulty in discovering and tracing remarkable providences. Time and again there have been interpositions and preservations.[47]

But the student of history everywhere meets the startling fact that the era of providential interposition after a while, in case of nearly every nation, gives place to the era of at

least apparent providential desertion. For a time the Jewish commonwealth was seemingly a special child of Providence. The same was true of Greece; often were the Greeks called upon to celebrate their deliverances at the hands of the gods. Carthage more than once had occasion to express gratitude for what appeared to them to be divine aid. Plutarch, under the title "Concerning the Fortunes of the Romans," calls attention to the fact that the leading Romans attributed their success and greatness more to fortune than to virtue. "The temples dedicated to Fortune," he says, "are splendid and ancient, almost as old as the first foundations of Rome itself." After enumerating many providential interpositions in behalf of Rome, Plutarch continues: "What shall I say more? Has not Fortune relieved the city when it was reduced to the greatest extremity of danger?" The same writer also mentions the triumphs of the Romans over Philip, Antiochus, and the Carthaginians, likewise the cackling of geese at the approach of the Gauls, also the death of Alexander, as manifest interpositions of the gods in behalf of the Roman people.

The medieval republics, no less than the ancient, seemed to have enjoyed for a season the smiles of a benignant Providence. The plot of Jacques, for illustration, to surprise and capture Venice, was deep-laid, and seemed in the fairest way of accomplishment. "As an expression of gratitude for the escape of the republic from such a fearful danger," says the historian, "the Venetian government decreed that thanksgiving services in commemoration of the discovery of the plot should be held once every year in

all the churches, and that whosoever failed to join in celebrating the day should be hanged as a traitor.

Nor can anything be more marked than the apparent providential interpositions in behalf of the republic of the United Netherlands. But the time came in the history of the Netherlands, and of Venice, of Rome, of Carthage, of Greece, and of Palestine, when there was no interposition, and those republics, one after another, fell.

The lessons of history, therefore, should teach every American not to *presume* too much. The United States have been prosperous; the people have become proud, irreligious, and corrupt. Our fathers, in the *Mayflower*, began their famous political compact with the words, "In the name of God. Amen." Daniel Webster was accustomed to call this sentence the first clause of the American Constitution.

Such changes have been taking place in our political and religious life, however, that there has been a slow and sly erasure of this thought. The republic is in the way of forfeiting further claims upon divine providence. Indeed, were God strict to mark out iniquities, our doom would be already sealed.

But, aside from this, it ought to be borne in mind that the illiterate and immoral masses admitted to citizenship and franchise in this country may become uncontrollable. Political strifes may become more and more fierce. The day may dawn when a monarchy will result in the greatest good to the greatest number. Then, if that day comes, God will not longer interpose to save the republic, but will order its overthrow, and in mercy will permit a monarchy

to be established by those who have skill and daring sufficient to undertake and accomplish it.

It must be apparent, therefore, that our national safety needs something besides the securities suggested. Extent of territory and material aggrandizement will not save the republic. Our educational advantages are inadequate. Nor have we ground for assurance, if we remain as we are, that God will much longer interpose. None of these securities are protecting from conflicting religious interests and from social and political animosities, nor from a multitude of corruptions. And from these sources it is clearly apparent that threatening tempests are approaching.

CHAPTER III.

EXISTING PERILS. POPERY.

One of the most popular orators of this country addressed a college audience three days before Sumter fell. Walking to the edge of the platform, he asked, "What is going to happen?" and then whispered, with his hand above his lips, "Just nothing at all." He was the popular man upon the day of the address. Had there been another speaker present who had ventured to depict the actual scenes which followed during the next five years, he would have been scowled at and hissed. It is difficult for human nature to believe ill tidings, and the prophet of impending evils is often stoned. When Samuel tried to arrest the political determinations of the Jews by depicting the misfortunes that would come upon them, they would not believe. His noble words were to no purpose.

Demosthenes tried in vain, in his Philippics, to arouse the Athenians to a sense of the dangers which threatened them. They would not believe that there was occasion for alarm, and a strong party opposed the great orator, asserting that he was a disturber of the peace of Athens. But when it was too late, the Athenians woke from their slumber and beheld their ruin.

When the Grecian fleet was surrounded by the Persians

in the Bay of Salamis, Themistocles begged of Aristides to communicate the unpleasant news to the Greek council, on the ground that it would not otherwise be believed. When announced, the unpleasant truths were utterly discredited.

The intelligence of the destruction of the Sicilian armament was communicated to the Athenians by a barber from the Piræus; he was seized and put to torture, for being an idle bearer of falsehoods. Yet his reports were true, and Athens was shortly filled with affliction and dismay.

Thus likewise with Rome. When the envoys brought to the city the report that seventy thousand Gauls were marching upon them, the proud and self-confident Romans made no special preparations to meet the enemy. They were blinded by their conceits and supposed superiority. But the 18th of July, 390 B. C., was long remembered, for on that day Rome saw her army crushed by those despised Gauls. Later, while the great mass of the Romans were living heedlessly and carelessly, not imagining that any foe would be daring and resolute enough to march against the city, they allowed both the gates and the walls to go to decay. "They had not imagined," says the historian, "that an enemy, since the days of Hannibal, could threaten them." Sulla, with six legions, appeared before the walls of Rome, and his victory was complete.

This enumeration need not be carried further. In a word, the Jews would not believe, during the days of their prosperity, that their commonwealth would become an oppressive monarchy, and then be wiped out of existence. The Greeks, in the days of Grecian prosperity, did not believe in the overthrow of all its republics. The Car-

thaginians, when extending their commerce and conquests in every direction, did not believe that their magnificent metropolis would be so completely overthrown as to be known only in history. The Romans, when conquering the world, did not believe in the humiliation and degradation which have since befallen her people. The same is true of Genoa, and of Venice, of the Dutch and the French republics. Men are always saying, "peace and safety." "Life," says Hazlitt, "is the art of being well deceived." It is, however, an old adage worthy of frequent repetition, that "there is always danger when the persuasion exists that there is none." The confident man is warned to "take heed lest he fall." "To fear the worst oft cures the worst," says Shakspeare; and Edmund Burke declares that "Early and provident fear is the mother of safety." Some historic nations have seemed to have no wit until too late. The people of the United States belong to this class. As a rule, Americans never read history, and never learn anything from it. We "are treading in the same steps of injustice and crime that other nations have taken and regretted." Upon what grounds are we assured of exemption from similar regrets?

> "The careless trust, that happy luck
> Will save us, come what may —
> The apathy with which we see
> Our country's dearest interest struck,
> Dreaming that things will right themselves,
> That brings dismay.
>
> "No! things will never right themselves,
> 'Tis we must put them right."

The first peril noticed in our enumeration is the fact that the Roman Catholic Church, essentially a church empire, maintains a hostile attitude towards the free institutions of

the United States. Against a Holy Catholic Church we do not speak, but against scheming and ambitious ecclesiastics and bigots in that church, we speak and protest. There is much in the history of Romanism, much in its services, much in the devotion of its adherents, which fills every thoughtful person with admiration. Roman Catholicism appeals to us "by its cordial relations to all the fine arts — music, painting, sculpture, architecture — to whatever impresses most and delights the senses and the tastes. Her cathedrals are the wonders of the world, mountains of rock-work, set to music. Her elaborate, opulent, mighty masses make the common hymn tunes of Protestantism sound like the twitter of sparrows amid the mighty rush and wail of concentrating winds. Her ritual is splendid, scenic, and impressive to the highest degree, and all is exquisitely pervaded and modulated by the doctrine which underlies it. Every service, every vestment even, is full of significance. Nothing is too ornate or magnificent to be incorporated at once into her majestic and superb ceremonial. She moves, as she fights, like an army with banners. She is the Church of the Apostles, the Church of the Catacombs, where the new Christian kingdom was working underground, to overthrow and replace the Empire of Rome. She is the Church of the Fathers, the Church of the Great Councils, before which were lowered imperial shadows, to whose decisions faction bowed, and whose creed and decrees have governed and assimilated the universe of Christendom. She is the Church of the Middle Ages, which built cathedrals, organized crusades, established libraries, civilized barbarians, liberated slaves, preserved learning, laws, and arts, subjected barons, converted and ruled the haughtiest kings,

and which has since sent forth her heroic and conquering fathers to the ends of the earth — *ad majorem Dei gloriam*." Such is the Roman Catholic Church in the estimation of not a few who are standing even outside of her communion. And if this church were truly christian, in spirit and practice, were she less inclined to interfere with matters which are beyond her legitimate sphere, and were she less brutally intolerant, the American citizen would have no occasion for alarm or hostility. Americans could do no better, perhaps, as patriotic citizens, than to rejoice in her prosperity and even enter her communion. Indeed, we may go a step further, and say that if Romanism were truly christian in spirit and practice, were she a stanch friend of civil liberty, and a patron of general intelligence, were her ministers and officers cultivated and pure, were she, in a word, what she claims to be, we might, perhaps, fearlessly intrust to her hands the government of the world. For thereby the greatest good would doubtless come to the greatest number. But it is a matter of painful regret that the Roman Catholic Church is not christian enough to be trusted; rather is she to be dreaded.

Without maligning the Roman Catholic Church, we may show, from the published admissions of her own adherents and advocates, what, in political matters, is her attitude towards all human governments. The reader will do well to bear in mind that when the Christian Church was first organized in Rome, it consisted of a body of devout religious teachers and laymen. But after a short time, those ecclesiastics who had charge of the larger and more wealthy churches, being in possession of peculiar advantages, were in consequence raised to special eminence. Thus com-

menced church hierarchy. One step led to another, until the highest in ecclesiastical office, namely, the Bishop of Rome, claimed supreme spiritual authority. This assumption of full supremacy by the Romish Church is properly referred to the time of Pope Gregory I. (590 to 604). The prestige of the city, the former capital of the world, and the dogma of divine succession, gained a victory for Romanism which could not have been secured in any other city of the world.

The claims that the Roman Pope is the vicegerent of God on earth, and that he is the supreme monarch of an empire, in comparison with which all other empires dwindle into insignificance, and to which they should yield implicit obedience, are the political ideas which for centuries have been zealously maintained by Romanists. Hence, therefore, modern Romanism, which is properly termed Popery, is from the nature of the case inimical towards every form of civil government which is not under her domination. She assumes the right to rule or destroy, by means fair or foul, as it best suits her purpose. The words of Secretary Thompson are suggestive, almost startling: "He who accepts Papal infallibility, and with it the ultramontane interpretation of the power of the Pope over the world, and thinks that by offending the Pope he offends God, will obey, passively, unresistingly, uninquiringly. Such a man, whether priest or layman, high or low, is necessarily inimical to the government and political institutions of the United States; with him, his oath of allegiance is worth no more than the paper upon which it is written."

James Anthony Froude, under the heading, *What a Catholic Majority could do in America*, takes much the same

view: "We agree that the spiritual part of man ought to rule the material; the question is, where the spiritual part of man resides. The Protestant answers that it is in the individual conscience and reason; the Catholic says that it is in the church, and that it speaks through bishops and priests. Thus, every true Catholic is bound to think and act as his priest tells him, and a republic of true Catholics becomes a theocracy administered by the clergy. It is only as long as they are a small minority that they can be loyal subjects under such a Constitution as the American. As their numbers grow, they will assert their principles more and more. Give them the power, and the Constitution will be gone. A Catholic majority, under spiritual direction, will forbid liberty of worship, and will try to forbid liberty of conscience. It will control education; it will put the press under surveillance; it will punish opposition with excommunication, and excommunication will be attended with civil disabilities."

That we may not misjudge of Popish movements and claims, we briefly quote from some of her leading authorities.

"We are bound to believe that the Holy Father should enjoy that political independence which is necessary for the free exercise of his spiritual authority throughout the entire world."—*Political Tract of the "Catholic Publication Society."*

"While the state has some rights, she has them only in virtue and by permission of the superior authority, and that authority can only be expressed through the church, ... regardless of temporal consequences."—*Catholic World.*

"No civil government, be it a monarchy, an aristocracy,

a democracy, or any possible combination of any two or all of them, can be a wise, just, efficient, or durable government . . . without the Catholic church; and without the Papacy there is, and can be no Catholic church. . . . . The state is only an inferior court, and is bound to receive the law from the supreme court (the Vatican), and is liable to have its decrees reversed on appeal." — *Dr. Orestes Brownson.*

"The spiritual sword is to be used by the church, but the carnal sword for the church. The one in the hand of the priest, the other in the hands of kings and soldiers, but at the will and pleasure of the priest. It is right that the temporal sword and authority be subject to the spiritual power. . . . . Moreover, we declare, say, define, and pronounce that every human being should be subject to the Roman pontiff." —*"Unum Sanctum" of Pius IX.*[48]

But Popery is wise. She does not often venture to take full control of the reins of government until she thinks herself able to manage them. At the outset, when she is not relatively strong, and when the mass of the people are prosperous and contented, she contents herself with seeking to add to her wealth, enfranchising her communicants, bidding for political preferment, and pleading for, or possibly asserting, her civil and political rights. But when there are political and social disturbances, and when the people are restless, and when party issues are hotly contested, then this papal empire, this enemy of free institutions, becomes an ugly factor, consolidating and strengthening in proportion to the discontents and disorganizations which divide and threaten the civil government. We see her consenting to live under any form of government, under monarchies, absolute, limited, or mixed; under aristocracies

more or less liberal; under republics, centralized or uncentralized, representative or democratic, in North or in South America, or elsewhere; but she never forgets or abandons her imperial intentions. France, successively monarchical, democratic, and consular, again monarchical, and now republican, in her form of government, has found Papacy changing with every political change. Under Philip II., St. Louis, Louis XI., Charles VIII., Henry IV., Louis XIII., Louis XIV., who had each bowed before the papal power, Romanists were on the side of monarchy. In the republic of 1792 they were republicans. Under Napoleon they were monarchists; and now again they are republicans. They are anything whereby they can the better control the people and the government. It is neither madness nor fear that makes Popery one thing and another, but policy.

In the United States Popery will be found to side with one party, then with another, until each is so weakened that she can rule both. She will join hands with infidels against Protestants, but having gained her object, she will consign both allies and foes to contempt or to flames. She will make contracts and compacts, any number of them, but when she believes herself powerful enough to trample them under foot, if for her advantage, she will do so without scruple or hesitation.

But more than this, Popery justifies herself in resorting to measures the most intolerant and cruel. "Protestantism in the ascendency is *tolerant* of Popery; but Popery in the ascendency is *intolerant* of Protestantism." Republics tolerate Romanism while they are strong and she is weak; but

when she becomes strong and they are weak, she tolerates nothing opposed to her own rights of complete domination.

With evidences of the cruelty, as well as the intolerance of Popery, history abounds. Hundreds of Protestants murdered in Bohemia by order of Gregory XV.; the expulsion of fifteen hundred Moravians from their homes and country, under the direction of Cardinal Stein; the brandishing of the executioner's axe in Bavaria and Saxony until firesides were made so desolate that twenty thousand terrified people, to prevent further bloodshed, renounced Protestantism; the war against the Huguenots under Louis XIII.; the half million and more of the best citizens of Spain expelled, outlawed, or murdered; the desolations of the Netherlands under the bloody Alva; the expulsion of the Zellerdalers from their homes and kindred in Austria; the horrors of internecine war fomented in Switzerland by intriguing Jesuits; the cruel vengeance of popish domination in Sardinia, in Tuscany, in Baden, in Portugal, and in Ireland,— would seem to be enough, although only a part of the evils wrought, to call a world to arms for the purpose of driving from the face of the earth this merciless and bloody enemy of humanity.

It is said in reply that these times of proscription and violence are past. We should be glad to think so. But there is evidence that Popery, if strong enough, would still employ, *for the greater glory of God*, intimidation and murder. In a book entitled "Notes on the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore," held October, 1866, are these words: "Infidels are not to be tolerated, and their infidelity is not to be tried nor proved, but extirpated." In that same book, baptized heretics are pronounced infamous, and the right to

confiscate their temporal goods and subject them to corporeal punishment, exile and imprisonment, is unblushingly set forth. In answering the question whether heretics are rightly punishable even with death, it replies, "Yes, because forgers of money, or other disturbers of the state, are justly punished with death; therefore, also, heretics, who are forgers of the faith."

"It is," as Secretary Thompson remarks, "no trifling and idle thing for nations and peoples to find themselves thus plotted against; nor is it a trifling and idle thing for the people of the United States to find such an enemy, with drilled and disciplined troops, in the very midst of their peaceful institutions."

That this intolerant and cruel foe of personal freedom and civil governments is conscientiously all the more to be feared because conscientiously working to control the political destinies of the United States, should be a matter of anxiety to every republican the world over. Leading Popish ecclesiastics are fully alive to the fact, that of all countries of considerable size and influence, the United States is almost the only one in which the Pope can stand upon the same level with every citizen and be eligible to the highest office.

Gregory XVI., whose pontificate commenced in 1831, was the first pope who encouraged the idea that the "Holy Empire" would ultimately establish itself in the United States. In June, 1871, the late pope, while addressing a deputation of citizens from our republic, made use of this language: "The bearing of the Catholics of the United States fills me with hope for the future of the church. There was a cardinal once who was a prefect of the congregation, ... and he was wont to prophesy about Amer-

ica. He used to say so earnestly that the salvation of the church would come from America, that it made a deep impression on me, and I hold to the same opinion."

It was that same pope, Gregory XVI., who, nearly fifty years ago, said: "Out of the Roman States there is no country where I am Pope, except the United States."

But to make this imperial sway complete, civil liberty in the United States must be brought to an end. Hence it is not surprising that Pope Pius IX. condemned American liberty and denounced the doctrine that liberty of conscience and worship is the right of every man. Nor is it surprising that he declared that all the principles upon which our government is founded are pernicious to the Papal church, and that all those who maintain them preach the doctrine of perdition.

The response of the Papist, Dr. Orestes Brownson, is also suggestive and unmistakable: "We wish this country to come under the Pope of Rome. As the visible head of the Church, the spiritual authority which Almighty God has instituted to teach and govern the nations, we assert his supremacy, and tell our countrymen that we would have them submit to him."

The plea is now put forth that the United States of America, by legal right, belong to the Pope. "Columbus," says De Lorgues, a distinguished French Catholic, "gave the name of the Blessed Virgin to his ship, lifted the cross in her, departed on Friday, and commanded the sails to be unfurled in the name of Jesus Christ. It is in the name of Jesus Christ that he took possession of the lands he discovered. It was to honor the Redeemer that he erected the cross everywhere he landed." What follows? This: that

these territorial titles of the Church of Rome, obtained through the discoveries of Columbus, antedate all other rights and titles. Hence, therefore, the Pope simply bides his time to claim, politically, what is his own. Leading Papists confidently predict that the day is not distant when our *de facto* claims and titles must yield to the *de jure* domination of the Church of Rome.

The careless citizen, doubtless, is ready to reply that whatever the designs of Papists may be, there is no actual danger. It is admitted that the general feeling is that Popery is dying. She is dying, and thriving, too. She is dying at some of the original roots, but taking vigorous root further along and in other soils. In countries where one would least expect it, Scotland and England, she gains adherents even from the ranks of the brightest scholars and the noblest blood. The quiet with which the people of Great Britain received, a few months ago, the announcement that in Scotland there had been erected a Papal hierarchy, with an archbishop and a full complement of bishops, is instructive in contrast with the almost wild excitement into which the same people were thrown less than thirty years ago, when a Papal brief decreed the establishment of a similar hierarchy in England. Earl Russell intensified the passionate clamor of the day by vigorous denunciations of the "Aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism as insolent and insidious." Addresses of remonstrance were presented to the Queen from every part of the kingdom. A bill was introduced into Parliament to forbid Roman Catholic bishops from assuming the territorial titles given to them by the brief, and was carried by a vote of three hundred and ninety-five to sixty-three. "Now the Pope

asks permission of the Queen; it is granted. Scotland is provided with a fully-equipped hierarchy; no one protests; not even so much as a public meeting is called; and the whole matter is dismissed in a five-line telegram." Scotland now has six bishops, two hundred and seventy-two priests, and two hundred and sixty-four churches and chapels, while in 1851 she had but one hundred and eighteen priests, and ninety-seven churches and chapels. Leo XIII., it is thought, has already decided to create a Scotch cardinal.

A London periodical, the *Whitehall Review*, publishes a list of conversions to Romanism that have recently taken place in Great Britain among the upper classes. It includes the names of one duke, two marquises, five earls, fifteen barons and lords, seven baronets, three knights, one general, one admiral, ten members of Parliament, four Queen's counsel, four professors, one hundred and sixty-eight beneficed clergymen, sixty-seven of whom have become priests, and one hundred and ninety-eight gentlemen, sons of peers, fellows, and the like, fifty-one of whom have taken sacerdotal orders. Among the women of rank there are five duchesses, thirty-eight peeresses, wives of baronets, knights, and others, and thirty-three ladies of position who have gone over to the Church of Rome. Outside of people of rank have been many persons prominent in society, art, and literature. Some of these are Thomas Arnold, brother of Matthew Arnold, and son of Dr. Thomas Arnold of Rugby; Thomas Burnand, the proser of "Happy Thoughts;" Emily Bowles, the authoress; Florence Marryat, alias Mrs. Ross Church, the novelist; Miss Froude, niece of the historian; Miss Gladstone, sister of the ex-premier; Coventy Patmore, the

poet; "Professor" Pepper; Adelaide Anna Proctor, poet, and daughter of Barry Cornwall; Philip Rose, Arthur Sketchley; Mrs. Hope-Scott, grand-daughter of Sir Walter Scott; Elizabeth Thompson, now wife of Major Butler, painter of the "Roll Call;" and Robert Isaac Wilberforce, M. P., eldest son of the celebrated philanthropist.[49]

The numerical strength of Popery in the United States, according to Secretary Thompson's showing, is already surprising. They have one cardinal, seven archbishops, fifty-three bishops, six apostolic vicars, priests whose number it is impossible to estimate, with a membership of from six to eight millions. During nine years (1859–1868) they increased one hundred per cent., while Protestants increased but twenty-nine per cent. With the same ratio, if continued to about 1900, there will be in the United States eighty million Papists, to but seventy-five million Protestants.[50]

While it is generally thought that the increase in the future cannot continue to be so rapid as in the past, yet there are grounds for supposing that Papal increase will soon be in even greater ratio, not, perhaps, by old methods, but by new ones. The old ones are too slow. No one need be told that the politicians who now control the Popish vote do so by showing favor to Popish leaders. The democracy almost never dares to run the risk of losing this vote in great cities. In Brooklyn, N. Y., local politicians do not dare to appeal to the legislature at Albany for the repeal of the law exempting Romish property from taxation, because they would lose the Romish vote in Brooklyn. "A law was passed by the Albany legislature, imposing a perpetual tax of more than $225,000 annually on New York

city for the support of Roman Catholic parochial schools. In 1870, petitions from one hundred thousand citizens, and a wave of popular indignation, barely succeeded in effecting the repeal of this enactment." The party that now has at its disposal this Popish vote throughout the country, will have to enslave itself in the future still more, in order to hold it, and in order to gain what is now zealously sought, namely, complete political ascendency in the republic. This will be arranged. If in no other way, then, Catholic Spain will acquiesce, and Catholic Cuba, divided into different states, will ask admittance into our Federal Union. Papists in America will demand, some in all parties will think the measure wise, and a democratic Congress will yield, for it will not dare to oppose this Papal demand when it comes.

But more than this: outbreaks along the Mexican borders will continue. Papists do not care to have peace. We have grounds for supposing that they provoke hostilities and smile at depredations. The Roman Catholic journals of Mexico are very violent against Diaz, and urge war with the United States. The toleration of Protestantism by President Diaz is considered the highest of crimes by Papists. These conditions remaining, it is to be feared that within ten years there will be unlawful attempts to force Mexico, with her twenty-seven states, into our Federal Union. And the party which then condescends to bid for the Popish vote, will not dare oppose these hazardous political measures.

Again, it is well known that the leading Roman Catholics of the Canadas desire accession to the United States. The possible methods of gaining this object when the

proper moment arrives are so numerous, that it is, at the present moment, difficult to say which is the more probable. But the measure, favored as it is by the Papal world, is inevitable. More states thus enter the Union, and are represented in Congress. Let, therefore, those who apprehend no danger from Popery, consider that, should Cuba, Mexico, and Lower Canada, or should Cuba and Lower Canada without Mexico, be annexed, the United States, for all that Protestants could do to prevent it, would sink, in a day, helplessly under the rule of the Popish priesthood. Ambitious demagogues and ambitious priests would thus unite in bringing to an end our civil liberties.[51] The overthrow of a government, free or monocratic, does not trouble Popery, for she can flourish, and, perhaps, best flourish, in countries which she has first ruined.

While estimating the political power which is to aid in accomplishing these results, also while estimating the present and prospective strength and increase of Popery, the freedmen must not be overlooked. Before the war, the Papists seemed to have no special interest in the Southern slaves, but since they have become freedmen, and since the ballot has been placed in their hands, they have been visited by all branches of Papal charities. They have been embraced by the priest, and invited into his fold. The eyes of many of these ignorant and superstitious colored people have been strongly allured toward Papal pomp, show, and ceremony, and not a few have devoutly kissed the crucifix. The freedman has discovered that he is less troubled by his political enemies when becoming a Romanist. He has also learned that his body is better provided for when he makes

the sign of the cross. Is it a matter of wonder if he asks, Why shall I not make it?

In the hour of sickness the Sister of Charity goes to his relief. Is it, therefore, a matter of surprise that he has welcomed the lady of white hood and black dress as an angel of mercy?

Those of the freedmen who still desire education for themselves or their children, seeing that Protestants are hesitating and closing their schools even while filled with pupils, and seeing Romanists opening new schools in every quarter, have asked, Why may we not form these new and apparently permanent and beneficial alliances?

The reasons as yet assigned for not doing this, have neither convinced nor prevented them. The Boston secretary of the American Missionary Society has published the statement that, in certain localities, being obliged to discontinue schools for lack of funds, the colored children *en masse* have gone into the neighboring Catholic schools, which were eagerly opened to receive them. And this course has been strongly advocated by some of the leading negroes of the North. George T. Downing, an educated and intelligent colored man, has been so nettled with the disabilities and abuses of his people, and with the caste and prejudices of Protestant churches against them, that he declares the Catholic church to be the only reliable refuge of freedmen. "All that the poor, downtrodden blacks of the United States have to do," he says, "is to 'fellowship' with this strong, courageous, well-disciplined church, and they thereby become not only a part of her power, but add to the power which will protect them." He further says: "I am fully persuaded that a general alliance, on the part of the

colored people of America, with the Catholic church of America, would be the most speedy and effective agency to break down American caste, based on color."

The colored people have not been slow to discover these apparent advantages, especially when approved and urged by the educated of their own nationality. As might be expected, by public resolutions they have more than once recognized this deep interest of Romanism in their educational welfare, and have formally conferred with the authorities of the Catholic church to ascertain to what extent they may look to it for assistance.[52]

But, replies some one, suppose the Papist does assume to take in hand the education of the colored people, what objection can be raised? This objection can be raised, that those colored children are to become voters, and in Papal schools they will not receive such education as will fit them for worthy and loyal citizenship. In the first place, education under Papal instruction will be utterly inadequate in quantity. The priest and the Jesuit do not believe in full mental development for the mass of their communicants.

In the island of Sardinia, which for ages has been entirely under the control of the Romish clergy, there are 512,384 in a population of 547,112, who can neither read nor write. The priests have made no efforts to remove this illiteracy.

Spain, too, has been called the paradise of priests. It is solidly Papal. The Spaniards have shown themselves, in the past, to be a remarkable people. They have displayed vast energy, and have a grand and stately history. There was a time when Spain had fleets in all zones. They were once a nation of schools and scholars. "By a circular letter to the Bishops in 789, Charlemagne," says Guizot, "required

them to establish elementary schools in their cathedral cities for the gratuitous instruction of the children of the freemen and of the laboring classes, while schools of a superior grade were to be opened at the same time in the larger monasteries for the study of the higher branches of learning." Spain was included. But the Spaniards are to-day what Edmund Burke once called them, "stranded whales on the coast of Europe." Education for nearly three centuries in the hands of priests and Jesuits, has brought forth its legitimate fruits. By the last general census of Spain, it was found that of the sixteen millions population of the kingdom there were only a trifle over two millions men and about seven hundred and sixteen thousand women able to read and write. There were 316,557 men and 389,211 women able to read but not to write. All the rest, upward of five millions men and six millions eight hundred thousand women, could neither read nor write. At the preceding census, the total number of persons of both sexes able to write, was found to be considerably less than one-fifth of the population. It was rare in the latter part of the eighteenth century, or at the beginning of the present, to find a peasant or an ordinary workman who was able to read. This accomplishment, among women, was even held to be immoral. Are masses like these fit for the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship? Or is it safer to commit to the hands of Papal clergy the education of the American voter?

Italy presents nearly the same showing. Ninety-nine and three-fourths per cent. of the population of Italy were returned as Catholics in 1871. The Roman clergy has managed Italy for centuries, and the Pope himself has

governed certain of its states. According to the census of 1864, out of a total population of nearly twenty-two millions, there were in Italy seventeen millions who could neither read nor write. Of these, nearly eight millions were men, and over nine millions were women. In the Basilicata, in Calabria, and in Sicily, more than nine-tenths of the inhabitants could neither read nor write. Had the priesthood really desired the enlightenment of its spiritual children, would this illiteracy have overshadowed sunny Italy?

"We must certainly root out printing," said the Vicar of Croydon, "or printing will root us out." Essentially the same feelings seem to be entertained by the most of those who are seeking to manage the education of Papal communicants. We therefore protest against Romanists being allowed to take into their hands the education of the freedmen. Their parochial schools provide no adequate safeguard against the most deplorable ignorance. Their instruction would tend to make the United States, in respect to popular intelligence, what Spain is, what Mexico is, what Italy is, what Ireland is, and what other exclusively Catholic countries are the world over and history through.

But not only is Papal education inadequate in amount, but it is loaded with falsehood. The text-books authorized for their schools grossly belie the facts of history. They teach, for instance, that Popish priests had nothing to do with the death of most of those who suffered in the era of martyrdom. "They teach that, at the moment of execution, the priest appeared at the side of the man, only to inspire him, if possible, with sentiments of repentance; that all the priestly council did was to pronounce the individual guilty and deliver him over to the secular authori-

ties, who, without clerical coercion, inflicted the just penalties."

The horrors of the Spanish Inquisition are glossed over. "By punishing a few obstinate individuals," reads one of the Catholic school-books, "the monarchy was saved from the civil wars which desolated Germany, Switzerland, and Holland." "The Inquisition did not cause so much blood to flow as did the Calvinistic Reformation."

Bismarck, after a visit to France, said that the saddest sight he saw in that country was the manipulation of the historical text-books by Romish ecclesiastics. It is the same in all countries where the priesthood rules.

A book bearing the title "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," which is placed in the hands of young Catholics in France and the United States, contains these statements: "Martin Luther died forlorn of God, — blaspheming to the very end. His last word was an attestation of impenitence. His eldest son, who had doubts both about the Reformation and the Reform, asked him for a last time whether he persevered in the doctrine he preached. 'Yes,' replied a gurgling sound from the old sinner's throat, — and Luther was before his God!" . . . . . "Calvin died of scarlet fever, devoured by vermin, and eaten up by an ulcerous abscess, the stench whereof drove away every person. In great misery he gave up his rascally ghost, despairing of salvation, evoking the devils from the abyss, and uttering oaths most horrible and blasphemies most frightful."

Children who are in the reformatory institutions of Massachusetts have been compelled, on pain of horse-whipping, to commit to memory subject-matter found in a book written by Father Baddeley, published in Boston, bear-

ing the title "A Sure Way to Find Out the True Religion." The following are some of the questions and answers:

"*Question.* Must not, then, the Protestant Church, instead of leading men to heaven, infallibly lead them to hell?

Answer. "We certainly have too great reason to apprehend it, particularly when we consider that Christ has made two things necessary to salvation: namely, true faith and good works; and, as we have shown before that the Protestant Church has not the true faith, it is impossible that her works can save her. . . . . As none of the inhabitants of Jericho could escape the fire or sword but such as were within the house of Rahab, for whose protection a covenant was made, so none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, who belong not to the (*Catholic*) Church of God."

After depicting the sins of Protestants, the question is asked, Can we find no better kind of holiness among Catholics?

Answer. "Yes; the holiness of the Catholic religion is indeed very different from that of other religions, because the religions framed by men teach doctrines invented by Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Whitfield, and other deluded and wicked men, whereas the Catholic Church teaches only that doctrine which Christ taught his apostles."

In speaking of the changes wrought in England by the Papal faith, Father Baddeley says: "Everything brightened, as if nature had been melted down and re-coined. It changed the people that were rude, savage, barbarous, and wicked, into a nation mild, kind, benevolent, and holy, teaching men to do in all things as they would be done by. And so much did men live up to this grand rule, that in

those days, when England was Catholic, a boy or girl might openly carry a bag of gold or silver, and carry it safely all the country over, and golden bracelets were hung up near the highways, which no man dared to touch."[53]

Of Fox's Book of Martyrs, this same treatise says: "These saints were nothing but a set of deluded, rebellious, impious, and blasphemous wretches, most of them put to death by the law of the land where they resided for their crimes. Many of them were condemned for their lewd lives, conspiracies, rebellion, and murder; some for witchcraft and conjuring; others for sacrilege and theft, and even for flatly denying Christ himself. In fact, to call a man one of Fox's saints, is become the same as to call him a great rogue." Martin Luther is described in the following terms: "Thus I have given you a short but true character of Fox's Elias, the conductor and chariot of Israel, who, he says, ought to be reverenced next to Christ and Paul! What! can a man who was mad with lust — who lived in adultery, and caused others to do the same — who wrote most horrid blasphemy, and corrupted the Bible — who was a notorious drunkard and companion of devils — who was as proud as Satan himself, a preacher of sedition and murder; what! can this wretch be compared with Christ and Paul?" For not faithfully committing these falsehoods, children in our public reformatory schools have been threatened with horse-whipping.

It is in view of instruction like this that a distinguished writer and lecturer has been led to say that if we were "to call up the scholars out of the two or three thousand parochial schools in the United States, and ask them to recite, they would give us, in answer to our questions, the substance of these intensely sectarian text-books — these pre-

cious statements about the Catholic authors, these whitewashed pages concerning the Inquisition, the Edict of Nantes, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew; these subtle insinuations of Catholic doctrine concerning Mariolatry and the infallibility of the Pope; these presentations of American history in such a manner as to make the impression that the Jesuits were the fathers of the best part of our civilization. This is what we should hear from these young lips. But if Romanism does here what she has done abroad, and what she wishes to continue on American soil, pretty soon the answer you will get will not be out of that book, nor that, nor that, simply because the children cannot read nor write."[54]

It is a matter of regret that the American people seem to fail in comprehending the vital point in this religious-educational controversy. A distinguished Episcopal clergyman has lately sided with the Papists thus: "What is more needed in the school question than anything else, is for people to be perfectly fair, and to remember that persons who hold a different faith from ours may be as honest as we are. The Roman Catholics have not been treated fairly in this matter. They believe in the religious education of their children, and it has often been the boast of Protestants that the public schools could be used to destroy the religious belief of the Roman Catholic youth. They naturally resent this, and then comes the demand that the schools shall be strictly secular, and this goes so far in the wrong direction that no one is satisfied. The Roman Catholics are American citizens, and they have just as much right to a voice in the management of the schools as the Protestants have; but, if the schools are used for proselyting in favor of

Protestantism, it is acting unfairly to the Roman Catholics, and doing to them what we should not be willing to have them do to us."

We reply that Protestantism is the friend of civil liberty, and Popery is its enemy; therefore, in a free country, the Papist, with his foreign instincts and sympathies, should not have equal voice in the management of the education of those who are to exercise the rights of franchise. Indeed, he should have no voice at all.

A noted Unitarian clergyman has fallen into this same error. He says: "In the United States are children of parents representing portions of all the great faiths of the world. No wonder, then, that the question has come up, and that it agitates the public mind and demands a settlement as to what religion, if any, shall be taught all these children in the public schools. Here are Catholics, Protestants, Orthodox, Universalists, Free Religionists, Buddhists, Confucianists, Jews, Paulicians, Hindoos. What religion shall the church be permitted to teach in the public schools? Shall it be permitted to teach any? It is not a battle between religion and irreligion; it is a contest between rival religions. Every one looks at it from a religious standpoint. To each man the religion in which he intensely believes is a matter of supreme importance. State oppression or state interference in this highest, supreme, most sacred of all matters, is tyranny odious and unbearable. What right has the state to teach my child a doctrine that I believe shall issue in irremediable, eternal ruin to that child? If I were a sincere, earnest, intense believer in the Catholic Church, I would fight this thing to the death."

These aiders and abettors of Popish disturbance and

demands are caught unawares. They have missed entirely, in their discussions, the radical distinctions between Protestantism and Popery, as related to our republican institutions. John Locke's theory was that the state should grant entire liberty of opinion and practice in matters of religion to all except atheists, who he thought could not be good citizens, and Roman Catholics, whom he excepted on the ground that their primal allegiance to the Pope of Rome made them untrue in their allegiance to the king of England, and therefore unsafe citizens in the state.

The Episcopal clergy of the United States, who either sympathize with Papists or are significantly silent upon these public-school questions, and liberal Unitarians who, from singular notions, side with Papists in their conflicts with Evangelical Protestantism, forget entirely that the Pope's infallibility is a fundamental doctrine enforced upon the minds of the young, and that children trained under such teaching are likely to become a dangerous element in a republican government. They forget that Protestantism and republicanism are one, and that Popery is an absolute monarchy. They forget to what the people of this country are indebted for their liberties. Says De Tocqueville: "The greatest part of North America was peopled by men who, after having shaken off the authority of the Pope, acknowledged no other religious supremacy. They brought with them into the New World a form of Christianity, which I cannot better describe than by styling it a democratic or republican religion. This contributed powerfully to the establishment of a republic, and a democracy in public affairs; and, from the beginning, politics and religion contracted an alliance which has never been dissolved."

Protestants, of whatever name, likewise infidels and democrats, who side with Popery in these educational questions, forget that early alliance, without which there had been no free and independent republic of the United States. They forget that Popery is unchangeable, and that Boniface IV. wrote to King Athelbert of England thus: "If any king, or any bishop, clergyman, or laic, shall essay to infringe the decrees of the Popes, he shall incur the anathema of Peter and of all his successors." These men who side with Papists forget that in 1565, Melendez of Spain, sent to our shores by his king, put to death everybody "within the walls" of North Carolina, "including the aged, the women, and children," saying, "I am Melendez, of Spain, sent to gibbet and behead all Protestants in these regions. The Frenchman who is a Catholic I will spare; every heretic shall die!"

These men forget that Popery is ready, when strong enough, to repeat these deeds of the past. It was only a few days since that in Spezia, Italy, at a service in honor of Mary, a Catholic priest showed his feelings toward the Bible by an *auto-da-fé*—a burning of all copies of the Scriptures that could be gathered in the city and surrounding villages. It is said, as the flames arose the cry was heard, "Burn the Protestants!" These men forget that Pius IX., in 1864, condemned the liberty of the press, of conscience, and of free speech; and that Leo XIII. is to-day carefully studying the measures and dogmas of Pius IX., with a view of faithfully adopting and carrying them out.[55]

These men, now siding with Papists, seem to forget that the Papal authorities of Tuscany, in 1851, banished Count Grucciandini for simply having a Bible in his

possession. They forget that, in 1852, the Papal powers of Portugal decreed imprisonment and fines against all who opposed "the Church." They forget that, in 1860, Manuel Matamoras, of Spain, was sent to the galleys for eleven years, for daring to follow his conscience and preach Protestantism. They forget Father Dufresne of Holyoke, and Father Scully of Cambridgeport.[56] They forget that Papists deny the right of the civil power to have anything to do with education.[57] They forget — O for pages of history written in flames! Then, perhaps, men would read them, and no longer aid and abet Papists, who are determined upon reproducing in the United States the condition of Italy, of Spain, of Ireland, of Lower Canada, of Mexico, and of the afflicted republics of South America.

Before these sympathizers with Papal demands take an additional step, let them ask men who have given attention to these subjects in some of their broader relations, whether it is safe to allow the Pope, priests, and Jesuits to manage the education of our future citizens. "Ask Gladstone, as he bends over the work of writing the learned pages of his pamphlet on Vaticanism, and summons all history to testify that the education, to say nothing of the liberty of a people, is *not* safe under exclusively Romish auspices. Ask Prince Bismarck. At his fireside, in his palace at Varzin, he has a costly tapestry representing King Henry IV., in smock and barefoot, kneeling three days in the snow at the door of the palace of Pope Hildebrand, imploring absolution in vain, until his humiliation had been so protracted as to become what the Roman pontiff thought to be the proper symbol of the lowness of the civil power, when set up over against the ecclesiastical."

"Popery," as John Milton declared, "is a double thing to deal with, and claims a twofold power, ecclesiastical and political, both usurped, and the one supporting the other." These usurpers must not be encouraged, and their usurpations must be frowned upon, and unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly condemned by every Protestant in America. While full liberty of conscience belongs sacredly to every human being, and while the state should protect him so long as he does not trespass upon the rights of others, and is a peaceable and orderly citizen, yet the moment he becomes a trespasser he forfeits his liberty, and should become a convict.

M. Edmond About, in the September number of the *Nineteenth Century*, powerfully vindicates the recent action in the French Assembly on the educational question, in seeking to deliver the nation from the influence of the Papal powers. He says: "The absolute independence of some few thousand monks might be tolerated, were they to devote themselves to a purely contemplative life, or to confine themselves to preaching in the pulpit, writing in the papers, and publishing works of doubtful casuistry or distorted history. But directly they lay hands on education — when they turn their convents into schools, and entice thousands of children of the middle classes, for the purpose of moulding their young minds and inculcating their particular ideas — it behooves the state, not merely as a right, but as a bounden duty, to be up and doing. So, at least, thought the Duc Victor de Broglie, M. Guizot, M. Thiers, M. Villemain, and all the great Parliamentary men of 1844."

The fact is, when any devoted republican sees Papal power, which for ten centuries has been the most pro-

nounced, unscrupulous, and relentless enemy of free institutions, take in hand the education of hundreds of thousands of our future voters among the foreigners of our Northern States, and hundreds of thousands in the Southern States, he ought to be horrified. The peril cannot be overestimated. But Americans see no danger "until the fire reaches the bones." Prussia is wise; she sees the danger, and, with surprising boldness, is defying the enemy. But America is blindfolded, and is bowing in timid submission. Gladstone has seen the impending struggle in England, and has uttered his courageous and prophetic warnings. But the Republic of the United States has no Gladstone, and Congress is dumb as a corpse.

We have several times in this discussion referred to the Jesuits. They are Papists of the most dangerous type. They constitute a ring within a ring, having eyes within and without. They dress in all garbs, speak all languages, they know all customs, they are everywhere present, yet nowhere recognized. In South America, in Cuba, in the Canadas, in every state of Europe, in the Indies, in China, in Japan, in Asia, in Africa, everywhere, stealthily at work. They are despotic in Spain, constitutional in England, bigots in Rome, idolaters in India; they study Confucius in China, and are democrats in America. They are democrats here, because they expect to share the emoluments of future democratic victories. They have wealth, but are neither spendthrifts nor misers. They use their money freely whenever it can be used in the interest of the Church. For any secret service they reward handsomely. The spy is liberally paid, the civil officers of any country, and even those fashionable women who infest every court and con-

gress on earth, are bribed and bought over by the princely offers of this sly and intriguing order of Jesuits. "There is no record in history of an association whose organization has stood so many years, unchanged by all the assaults of men and time." They are never discouraged, and when beaten back they always begin the work again at the very place where it suffered interruption. Some of the rules of this order are monstrous beyond estimate.

Says Sanchez: "A man may swear that he never did such a thing (though he actually did it), meaning within himself that he did not do it on a certain day, or before he was born."

Father Filiutius gives this method of evasion: "After saying aloud, 'I swear I have not done that,' to add in a suppressed whisper, 'I have done that.'"

Father Escobar lays down this law: "Promises are not binding when the person making them had no intention to bind himself." Such are the teachings of these treacherous spies, who are in our midst to destroy our liberties. They have been dreaded and yet relied upon, worshipped yet abhorred, hurled down, yet have risen again with increasing activity. They have even dared to assail the Pope; they poisoned one Pope because he was opposed to their order. The late Pope, in his early reign, sided against them, but their menaces were so hostile that when he walked the streets of Rome people were wont to shout, "Father, beware of the Jesuits." He at length yielded to their claims. The present Pope, fearing for his life, dares not oppose them. Boston-educated Archbishop Williams dares not take a stand against them in their present agitation of the school question. To use Gladstone's suggestive

expression, "this Society of Jesus ever remains the most perfect instrument of mental servitude ever devised."

Pope Pius VII. called the Jesuits his "Sacred Militia;" he recognized in them his best-drilled and best-disciplined troops. And it is this Church Militia which is now ordered to this land, to watch and take possession when the favorable moment shall come. These Jesuits are already in our marts of business; they are in our army and navy; they are in our halls of legislation; they are upon our school committees, — the most sacred office in this republic, — and we do not know who they are. Priests and Jesuits are already assuming the direction or the actual government of our largest cities.

Blackstone in his day made this note: "The priests would have ingulfed all the real estate of England. It took centuries to protect and perfect the nation against their rapacity and schemes to avoid the statutes."

But we have no protection. The researches of Dexter A. Hawkins have shown, what no one ventures to deny, that the Papal Church in New York city has drawn from the public treasury in the past eleven years, $6,007,118. In 1878 alone she drew $710,350. She has obtained from the city donations of real estate to the amount of $3,500,000. On an average, in New York city, she has received from the public treasury an annual gift of more than $500,000.

The Jesuits are the prime movers in these schemes of obtaining control of the large centres of the nation.[58] They are likewise doing the most successful work in the Southern states. Always the shrewd and artful, but respectful and condescending servants of the church, willing to become "not merely the equal, but the inferior, of the lowest," by

boasting that they see no difference between souls on account of the color of the skin, and by looking carefully after all forms of distress and want, they are successfully manipulating the colored voters, and have been more successful with them than we could wish.

Fifteen years ago the colored Catholics of Washington could have been gathered in a room fifteen feet square. It is now reported that priest Barotti has gathered a large congregation of colored people in Washington, "erecting for them the most magnificent church-edifice at the Federal capital." Fifteen years ago there was scarcely a score of Catholic voters in South Carolina; it is claimed that there are to-day not less than fifty thousand. In view of these facts, true of other Southern cities and states, it looks as though Rome is seeking to bring together, for her support, the "negro vote and the foreign vote." Then what?

Says a close observer of political affairs: "The other day I met a politician, one of the astutest men of Massachusetts, and he said to me, 'Lately I was in Washington, and went into a Romish church that was almost a cathedral, and found it filled with negro worshippers. Do you think,' he whispered to me, 'that it is possible that the foreign vote and the negro vote may be massed together and exploited by the hand on the Tiber?'"

It sometimes seems that the bit of paper, with a list of names on it, dropped from black and brawny fingers, is to seal, some day, our national destiny. How much like a providence of God it would be, if these black men, in some impending crisis, should be left to wreck the republic which has so brutally wronged them!

One of the wisest bishops of the Methodist Episcopal

Church North has spoken words which deserve a place in all our councils: "The black, blind giant that we have admitted to the temple of Liberty, if only his eyes be couched, may buttress its walls; but if left blind, he may, in some political crisis, where the beams are in equipoise, pull the fair fabric to the ground."

These Jesuitical priests, who are doing so much mischief in the United States, have been unendurable in other countries. They were expelled in 1507 from Venice, in 1708 from Holland, in 1764 from France, in 1767 from Spain, in 1820 from Russia, in 1829 from England, in 1872 from Germany, and in 1873 from Italy. They have been expelled from several of the South American republics, also from Mexico, and have just been pronounced outlaws in the French republic. They are in trouble in Bavaria, Switzerland, and elsewhere. The United States is therefore likely henceforth to be the paradise of Jesuits. They can flourish here under the toleration and well-nigh unrestricted license of our free institutions as nowhere else. Their aggressive work will begin just as soon as there is believed to be strength enough to carry it out. Every intelligent Papist understands that all governments are *de facto* which are not established or authorized by the Papal Church, that obedience to a government existing *de facto* can last only while the church permits it, and that the church permits it only so long as she is unable to prevent it.

The papal power will all the sooner dare to be aggressive in the United States because of our fierce political and social strifes. All history shows that Popery is powerless when watched and opposed by a strong, free, and united people, but under the leadership of Jesuits she instantly rises into im-

portance when discords rend in sunder that people. Were we of this country united, there would be no ground for immediate alarm. But we are not united; we are divided, and there is in consequence the gravest occasion for alarm.[59] There is no relief in the thought of a future united political opposition. With neither of the two great Protestant political parties are Papists friendly. Indeed, from the nature of the case, they are hostile to both, but side with that from which the greater advantage is likely to be gained. The Papal Church is seeking from the democratic party at present to gain money and favorable legislation; but when nothing more can be gained by her present alliance, she with her heel will grind that party into the dust. Cannot the two parties unite, therefore, in unfurling this political banner? "*There shall be no further compromises with these enemies of the republic.*" Nay, nay! The thoughts of party triumphs are too captivating. Men are hungry for office. Papal adherents hold the balance of power. We shall oppose and destroy one another, then Popery will have control of what remains. We are cursed with blindness and demagogism, and with timidity in proportion to our wealth. And since one's property, family, or person is safer if he sides with the stronger and more aggressive party, men will in great emergencies take that safer side.

The moment, therefore, that the papal power begins its more aggressive work, thousands of our citizens will immediately acknowledge allegiance. Only the minority in such times are willing to be martyrs. A mass of professional politicians, who have no principle, and who are always ready to enroll themselves under any banner where there is pelf or plunder, will likewise suddenly side with Papists,

and become the fiercest persecutors within its communion. When this foreign papal power begins her dictatorship, the world will be surprised at the number of American citizens who are willing to obey. But some will not obey. Then will follow a conflict, next a revolution, and after that, a demand coming from every freedom-loving and patriotic Protestant the country over, for some one man who will dare defy the Pope, and assume a military sway over the United States of America.

CHAPTER IV.

EXISTING PERILS. SOCIAL EVILS.

The student of history, who believes that the past tends to repeat itself, is, if patriotic, much troubled when watching certain tendencies in the American Republic. He knows that the selfishness of capital and the discontents of labor have united in cursing, bitterly cursing, every one of the extinct republics. Capital in the United States is already largely unchristian and selfish. Property, to the disadvantage of the many, is rapidly concentrating in the hands of the few. The larger establishments in every department of enterprise and industry, the owners of large estates, the heaviest owners in corporations, are crippling and then absorbing the smaller ones. The rich are growing richer, the poor poorer. Capital and labor, the larger capitalists and the smaller ones, are consequently bitterly pitted against each other in every state in the Union, with no immediate prospects of improved conditions or relations. There is certainly nothing in the normal laws of trade, nor in the ordinary laws of commerce, which can evolve or promise improvement.

Death, followed by the division of property, through bequests or among legal heirs, has in this country afforded partial relief. Still, the rapidity with which a very wealthy man, even in

America, can add almost without limitation to his wealth, and the ease with which he can impoverish those who attempt competition, are a peril of no small magnitude. All history shows that wealth grows more and more ambitious and greedy; poverty more and more restless and angry, with no possible cure for either except revolution. It would be a national safeguard, whether wise or unwise we do not say, if, after a citizen has accumulated a given amount, say one, five, or ten millions (a limit of some amount), then, that all further increase should be taken by the government to liquidate public debts, or to be expended upon public improvements. But such legislation can hardly be expected in a republic like ours until the conflict between wealth and poverty have brought the country upon the brink, or into the actual throes of national revolution.

The jealousies and animosities growing out of the greed of the rich on the one hand, and the equal greed of the poor on the other, have been very marked during the last half-score years. They have been such as well-nigh to destroy confidence between man and man, and such in some instances as to develop murderous threats, if not murderous intentions. What has rendered these embittered feelings all the more contagious among our native laborers is the fact that capital and corporations have in too many instances been bitterly cruel. The experience has been far too general that a few corporation managers, by enormous salaries and by speculative transactions, have absorbed the interests intrusted to them, and have left the smaller creditors helpless and penniless. When these discoveries are made, it need not be thought strange that "the cheaper, poorer, and more numerous employés should seize upon the

coarse power within their reach, and wield it for self-defence."

While the National Trust Company was in the hands of a receiver, a woman entered the office and asked for fifty dollars out of money that she had placed there for safety. The clerk said he could do nothing for her, and she then asked for twenty dollars, ten, and finally for five dollars, saying her children had nothing to eat, and she must have something. On being refused even five dollars, she burst into tears, exclaiming, "O my God! must my children die, while these rich thieves keep my money?" The rich are thus looked upon by the poor as the cause of their poverty, and therefore the worst feelings are engendered.

This evil has extended from individuals to communities and states. Western communities are in debt for railroads, for municipal improvements, for defaulted state bonds, indeed for every form of private and public enterprise. For twenty years they have been trying by various test cases to find some means of evading the payment of their negotiable bonds. An able journalist has thus pictured this struggle: "New state courts, constituted under the popular suffrage, decided the laws to be unconstitutional; cities abandoned their charter organizations to dodge the sheriffs, just as Mexican officials on the Rio Grande resign to block the wheels of extradition; states forbade cities and counties to levy money enough to pay the judgments. But out of its great arsenal the Supreme Federal Court issued new writs to meet each new exigency. In the time of President Lincoln the debtor municipalities even mooted a scheme to swamp the court with new justices, in order to thwart the 'bloated bondholder' of that day. Many of the

bondholders involved in this conflict have been foreigners, and many others of them citizens of eastern states, so that the suits have been brought in the Federal courts, and heard before justices for whom popular suffrage had no terrors. The cry of 'Bondholder,' raised in the House of Representatives as a term of reproach, is an echo of this long struggle, and utters the bitter feeling of communities which think themselves oppressed by creditors whom they think relentless."

When, therefore, the New England and New York congressmen and press characterize other congressmen as the "cheap riff-raff of the West and South," who legislate in the interests of fraud and plunder; and when the Western and Southern leaders and press speak of the "horrid capitalists," and "the bloated bondholders who live along the sea;" when Boston and New York protest against certain financial measures as dishonest, disreputable, and revolutionary; and when Chicago and New Orleans stigmatize the protest as the "shriek of eastern Shylocks;" when, in a word, the two links which are so vital to the prosperity of the country — the gold link and the iron link — are thus at variance, neither believing in, nor hardly daring to trust the other, — then the foundations of the republic, lacking an essential bond, begin to crumble.

In the midst of these conflicts between capital and labor are heard sounds the most of all to be dreaded in a republic, "the low and angry mutterings and threats of the idle, lazy, thriftless, profligate, drunken hordes in every part of the country, denouncing prudence, industry, enterprise, and thrift; denouncing property, the result of industry and economy, as robbery, and denouncing the wages of labor

as a degrading badge of servitude and slavery; denouncing the rich as the enemies of the country, and denouncing capital as the deadliest enemy of labor." These "flashes from the dark bosom of the multitude have, in more than one instance, revealed giant and terrific masses of barely suppressed passion."

Said General Garfield, in a speech delivered during the labor troubles of 1877: "I hold in my hand the copies of brief but eloquent letters and telegrams from ten great states of this Union, and all of them were sent within one week, calling upon the President of the United States for help; ten great states, reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, Maryland and West Virginia among them; ten great states, among them California and the empire states of the Northwest, calling for the arms of the republic to shield and save in their hour of distress. I therefore say boldly, while I will do as much as he who will do most to secure the rights of labor against iniquitous laws, and against the assaults of capital, when used unjustly, yet against all comers I am for the reign of law in this republic, and for an army large enough to make it sure." In such times of trouble, idlers in many ways make their unwholesome presence felt, and darken the air with plots against the security of property. These threatenings are like the roar of breakers on a lee shore.

Macaulay, speaking of the disturbed reign of James the Second, says: "On such occasions it will ever be found that the human vermin which, neglected by ministers of state and ministers of religion, — barbarians in the midst of civilization, heathens in the midst of Christianity, — who burrow among all physical and moral pollution in the

cellars and garrets of great cities, will rise at once into terrible importance." What adds to the danger is the fact, that when crops are short, and breadstuffs dear, or when business is depressed and wages low, then, ambitious and rotten, thrice rotten politicians are found in waiting to fan into flames the bad passions of both the laboring and the idle masses. For three years, ending last year, these rude political and revolutionary orators were busy calling the attention of the workingmen of the country to the sharp contrasts between the splendor of accumulated wealth and the squalor of pitiless poverty. The workers in coal-mines throughout the country were told to compare their unhealthy lives below ground with the sunshine, wealth, and power of the mine-owners. These reckless demagogues, with their brutal oratory, spoke, and men out of employment, men working on half-time and at reduced wages, listened, and began to feel that virtue no longer resided in honest labor. Iron-workers all over the country paused, gazed at the dismantled forge, and returned its sullen look with similar looks of their own. They paused, and looked, and then muttered their curses against the wealth that was able to make the "lockout."

Such have been our experiences within three years; but now that there is a slight revival of business, with readier employment, we have forgotten everything. Americans are among the most forgetful of nations. Short crops, dear breadstuffs, depressed business, low wages, and unemployed masses, no longer enter into our calculations of the future. But they should. Rome once found that she must give employment to her citizens, or the rude masses would render life within her walls unendurable. She gave employment,

whereupon all the surrounding countries poured upon her their surplus populations, and the second condition of Rome was worse than the first.

It is the same in America. Every revival of business sets a flood-tide of foreigners to our shores. It is estimated that the present year will add three hundred thousand immigrants to our population. Wise men are beginning to feel that the generosity with which we receive these new-comers is thoughtless and reckless. Formerly we imported cloth; latterly we have imported the laborer and manufactured cloth. A few years since, Mr. Emerson remarked that he could not tell which is the wiser policy; to-day it is apparent enough which would have been the safer policy.

Were these additions to our citizenship, in each instance, good and patriotic men, we should be the richer for every immigrant ship entering our ports. But somehow these arrivals, in many instances, have been much to our disadvantage.

Our first popular infidelity is traceable directly to European soldiery, sent to this country just before and during the Revolution. The earliest communistic crusade in this country was preached by foreigners, by Owen in person, aided by such socialists as G. H. and F. W. Evans, Fanny Wright, and A. J. Macdonald. The present threatening communistic and socialistic organizations would never have been known among us but for the presence of those foreigners who are destitute of both patriotism and religion. Men of this class have been held in check by the military arm of European states, and hence they have resolved to experiment in the United States.[60] Molly Maguirism is agrarianism imported from Ireland. Tramps, infesting

every state of the Union where they are not legally interdicted, are mostly of foreign birth. Labor troubles were scarcely known in the United States until the majority of our laborers were foreigners. They have come from every kind of European oppression, and from the slums of poverty. They have here received compensation, not, perhaps, in every case such as could have been afforded, but certainly far greater than in any other country or in any other period of history. Still they have been dissatisfied and restless.[61] And what adds to our perplexity is, that the second generation is worse than the first. The industrious and polite type of Irishman whom we met twenty years ago, is rapidly giving place to the indolent and insolent American-born descendant.

If these foreign poisons affected only those who have foreign blood or who bear the foreign name, we should be comparatively safe, at least for the present. But all who are engaged in manual labor, whether native or foreign citizens, have been more or less fevered and injured.

The perils are all the greater because these foreign, restless, and dissatisfied masses instinctively gravitate towards cities, manufacturing communities, and mining districts. One hundred years ago only one thirtieth of the population of the United States lived in cities of over eight thousand people. In 1800 the proportion of population living in cities having above eight thousand was one twenty-fifth; in 1810, and also in 1820, one twentieth; in 1830, one sixteenth; in 1840, one twelfth; in 1850, one eighth; in 1860, one sixth; in 1870, a little over one fifth. It is thought that the next census will show a still further increase of the population of cities, and that they will con-

tain fully twelve millions instead of eight millions, which was the number in 1870. New York is to-day the largest Irish centre in the world. It is more Celtic than Dublin. The naturalized voters of New York city outnumber the natives by fifty thousand.

Unrestricted immigration and an almost unqualified franchise has taken, in some localities, the civil government entirely from property-owners, and from the patriotic and industrious yeomanry of the country, and placed it in the hands of those who have not a single qualification entitling them to a voice in the affairs of our republic. The condition of New York city has already been alarming.[62] Improvement in the character of its future citizenship can hardly be expected. New York, comparatively, is only a village. Not far hence she is to be a city of imperial magnitude. "Put Chicago and New York together," says an honored lecturer, "and you have not made a London. Put in Brooklyn, and you have not made a London. Even put in Boston, and you have not made a London! St. Louis, San Francisco, and New Orleans, massed there at the mouth of the Hudson, would not make a London. Only a little over three million inhabitants that would make, while London claims, officially, just under four millions. We ultimately shall have a city at the mouth of the Hudson as large as the city that lies on the Thames." But London is only a village as compared with Nineveh or Babylon. When there is a Babylon at the mouth of the Hudson, there will speedily be a doom worse than that which befell Babylon on the Euphrates.

There is no escaping the additional painful fact, that the population of our cities is to increase in the future but little,

comparatively, from American births. American ladies are, in too many instances, Roman ladies over again.[63] The increase is to be from births among our foreign population, and from free immigration. Native Americans are already crowded out of some localities by men who have been reared under monarchical institutions; men who appear to have no clear idea of the principles upon which our institutions are based; men who seem to have a desire to exchange the independence of American citizenship for a serfdom, in which the government shall take its citizens, feed them from public cribs, and build them houses to live in. The men who are filling and controlling not only New York, but likewise other great cities of the United States, are the men from whom those who have property and families to protect may well start back with alarm, if not with horror.

In connection with this thought of domination in politics, we have already spoken of Papal designs. If she can keep the masses in ignorance, or, what is nearly the same, keep them in her own schools, she will work all the mischief we can well bear. But if she cannot do this, then we are in danger of something which is worse than Popery.

There is said to be a custom among the robbers of Italy, requiring that when a new confederate is brought into a gang of thieves he shall load a pistol, hold it before a crucifix, and fire it at the figure of our Lord. It is supposed that whoever has the audacity to do that, will not hesitate to do anything required of the most desperate brigand. A Papist who does violence to his convictions in renouncing his faith, is as much to be dreaded as the most zealous

Papal devotee. When a bishop of Paris, in 1871, was brought before Raoul Rigault, one of the boldest of the Communists, the venerable ecclesiastic, addressing his accusers, said, "Children, what do you wish to do with me?" "We are your betters," said Rigault, who was hardly thirty years of age. "Speak as if to your superiors. Who are you?" The bishop, whose charities had been known in Paris for a generation, replied, "I am the servant of God." "Where does he live?" asked Rigault. "Everywhere," was the answer. "Very well," said the Communist, "send this bishop to prison, and issue an order for the arrest of one God, who lives everywhere."

To smite the Roman Catholic Church without having a better religion to offer, is reckless in the extreme, because the views of the elder communists will be the substitute for no religion in the United States. "In religion they were atheist and infidel; in philosophy they were positivists; in political economy they were destructionists or levellers." The American descendants of French communism are entertaining much the same views. They disregard the sanctity of the Sabbath, and the rights of others. They pervert and overstate notions of liberty — as the mob, carrying the heart of a baker on a pole, indignant at the protest of Lafayette, exclaimed, "Is this our boasted liberty, that we cannot kill whom we please?" They enthrone a selfish interest over all society. They are oppressive to the individual, dictating what he shall and what he shall not do. They are ruinous to every branch of industry, destroying all fair competition. They are dangerous to the republic, hastening the possibility and necessity of an oligarchy

or a monarchy, at least some centralized power to keep their lawlessness in check.

Not all who belong to the labor organizations of the country entertain these extreme views. Yet there are, in many respects, strong bonds of sympathy between them, and there are possible combinations among these organizations that will, some day, paralyze every industry throughout the country.

Their aggressive movements in 1877 were not well matured or organized. Nevertheless, several states were greatly agitated. Since the suppression of the riots of that summer (1877), the work of forming secret labor organizations has been prosecuted with remarkable vigor. At present it is estimated that there are one million five hundred thousand voters who belong to secret associations in the United States, and whose avowed purpose is to acquire political power, and govern the country in such a way as to cripple capital, and promote the interests of manual laborers. This purpose may be seen in the following mottoes, taken from the walls of the rooms where these organizations meet, and from banners which they parade through public streets: — "Government protection from the cradle to the grave." "Nationalization of land, labor, education, and insurance." "The interest on money is a direct tax to support wealthy paupers." "The government should be the superintendent of trade and commerce, and the employer of the people." "Hunger knows no law." "Let Fall River remember that Moscow was burned to ashes." "Labor must be crowned king, even if it wades knee-deep in blood." "We stand ready on election day to take the life of any man, be he United States supervisor or other

officer, who attempts to debar voters from exercising the right of suffrage." "We, the workingmen, are in the majority, and shall install our candidate though the streets run with blood." "Gold sharks and Eastern gold bulls must be forced to disgorge." "What is the oppressed laborer to do now? Let him join with his fellows, and light the fires of a glorious revolution that will rid the world of so many useless aristocrats, and make America really, as well as in name, 'the land of the free.' UP WITH THE RED FLAG, AND DOWN WITH ARISTOCRACY."

We repeat, not all in these labor societies are thus violent, but there are multitudes who stand ready to practise upon the principles embodied in these mottoes.

"The Socialistic Labor Party of the United States," founded by German political refugees some six years ago, is now supposed to contain twenty-five thousand members. The following is a brief published statement of its aims: "The entire overthrow of the present social system; the abolition of all personal property in land and other means of production, and their cession to the state; the introduction of the co-operative plan in labor, so that every laborer may be a partner in every factory or workshop; the compulsory limitation of the hours of labor to eight hours a day or less, according to the requirements of the unemployed workmen; the regulation of the prices of labor by arbitration between the employer and the employed, until the co-operative system is introduced; compulsory education, and the opening of all colleges and universities free to all classes; the abolition of savings-banks; the abolition of direct taxation, and the institution of a scaled income tax; and the taxation of all church property."

Nihilism, too, persecuted in Russia, is seeking the fostering atmosphere of the United States. It is taking hold upon minds comparatively well educated, and, in some instances, of brilliant qualities. More or less pronounced, it has been heard from platforms in nearly every state East and West. A well-known, popular American-born lawyer has become its unwearied defender and advocate. A concise statement of this scourge, Nihilism, as uttered by one of its apostles, is the following: "Take the earth and heaven, church and state, take kings and Deity, and spit on them — that's our doctrine."

Medore Savini says that, "A country does not live behind fortified castles; it lives in the breasts of the citizens." But with such a citizenship, where are our defences?

As might be expected, crime is rapidly on the increase. False theories always ultimately lead to false or perilous conduct. From statistics recently given, it appears that in 1872 there were confined in the state prisons of the country, for the graver offences, some sixteen thousand criminals; in 1878, there were not less than thirty-two thousand — an increase in six years unparalleled, perhaps, in the history of crime. But if all the convicts and those awaiting trial had been counted, the number would have reached sixty thousand, — three times larger than that of the effective army of the United States. And what makes it still more alarming is the fact that the vast majority of these convicts were considerably under thirty years of age at their first conviction.

This increase of crime is especially marked in the very places where it is most to be dreaded. From 1860 to 1877, the population of New York increased fifty per cent., but the criminal commitments three hundred per cent. The

most deplorable feature is that those who are high in office, and who manage city affairs, are the worst of criminals, and yet often succeed in escaping punishment. Said Judge Davis, while commenting on "The Ring Frauds:" "The history of these trials develops what, I think, the history of no civilized nation, and probably of no barbarous people, has so clearly developed — the organization of a body of public officers for the sole purpose of robbing and plundering those who had put them in power. The worst feature of it all is that the whole body of these conspirators go substantially unwhipped of justice. . . . . To my mind, this presents a spectacle so abhorrent to my notions of justice, that, in disposing of the last of these cases — as I suppose this to be — I cannot help taking advantage of the opportunity to condemn it as a parody of public justice. It is a great public wrong that these men should have escaped from all substantial punishment for their crimes."

Keeping in mind the facts already presented, and extending the range of vision so as to take in not merely cities here and there, but the country at large, there is found in present tendencies not much to inspire encouragement. Had the United States England's ratio of inhabitants to the square mile, the population would almost equal the present population of the globe. But long before that is reached, the feebleness of Congress to maintain order will probably be apparent.[64]

Lord Macaulay, in letters written in 1858, predicted that whenever the United States have a population of two hundred to the square mile, the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian theories of our civil polity will produce fatal results. Europe has only eighty inhabitants to the square mile. Is

Macaulay extravagant in saying that when we have two hundred to the square mile we shall be obliged to manage our politics on some other supposition than that which supposes that government can be successfully administered "by a majority of the citizens, that is to say, by the poorest and most ignorant part of society"?[65] New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis, already have crimsoned pavements.

If, with vast areas of unoccupied land about us; if, with the largest possibilities for obtaining wealth at our command, we have had occasion for alarm, what will be likely to transpire when our multiplied citizenship is pent up, and when existing possibilities are cut off or restricted? Unless there is a change in the character of immigrants, and in the thinking of the laboring masses, the day is hastening when men will not talk of a "third term," nor of a tenth term, but will submit to any arm for any term which can give security to person and property. There can be no dictatorship in this country until the majority of our leading citizens demand it. Then there can be, and then there will be and ought to be. Our danger is not from individual usurpation; for, if it were oppressive, the usurper would be killed. Our danger is the mob, both in Congress and out of it, which we cannot kill. Patriotic citizens have already been heard to say that, sooner than be ruled by foreign Papal masses, or by foreign infidel hordes, or by both in combination under coalitions formed by Jesuits, or by ambitious political demagogues, they would rather the wrecked republic — such it then would be — should disappear forever from among the nations of the earth.

CHAPTER V.

EXISTING PERILS. POLITICAL EVILS.

The dividing line between the real or supposed limits of state and national rights under our federal compact is an object of contention, and when other differences are silenced, will divide the people of the United States into two great political parties. The absolute sovereignty of the individual state to control its own affairs, civil and judicial, without any interference from the General Government, is, in a word, the doctrine of State Rights. It involves the right to conduct state elections, and decide upon returns, without the presence of Federal officers or bayonets. It carries with it the right to authorize any social customs desired by the majority, such as slavery, polygamy, or exclusion of Chinese workmen, and even the right of the state to secede from the Union when the interests of the state would seem thereby to be better promoted.

In a modified form, the doctrine claims that allegiance to the State is primary, to the Union, secondary. The state flag holds the first place, the stars and stripes the second. The opposing party claims that the General Government should extend protection to an American citizen anywhere within her domains — protection in the field or in the shop, in courts of justice or at the polls, and that if this

protection can be secured in no other way, then the entire army and navy should be brought into requisition. Hence, on the one hand, the State-rights party logically approves the act of the present administration in withdrawing Federal troops from the Southern States, though in those states the legal voter is no longer safe if he casts or defends a ballot which conflicts with the opinions of the so-termed Bourbon leaders. But on the other hand, the party which opposes these views must logically condemn the withdrawal of troops from any state of the Union, south or north, where the person or property of a citizen is insecure. A citizen of the United States ought, it is claimed, to be as safe in Louisiana as in Liberia.

The State-rights party logically defends also the doctrine of secession. The opposing party denies this right.[66] The one party asserts that the federal compact is simply a free and dissoluble association of states, like the leagues of the Grecian commonwealths, or like those of the free cities of Germany. The other party claims that the states are a nation, and that the nation has no alternative but to ordain and execute impartial laws for the protection of the lives and the rights of national citizens.

By the State-rights party it is claimed that our danger is from too great centralization in the executive branch of the government, with a tendency to merge the presidency into a monarchy. The opposing party insists that while at present there is a tendency to centralization, it is not towards the executive, but towards Congress. Therefore it is not a monarchy which is threatening the nation, but an oligarchy.

We hope we do no injustice when we say that the leaders

of the South have never abandoned this dogma of State Rights. Hon. Alexander Stephens was its chief defender twenty years ago. He is to-day. The theory with the South is not, as it is with the North, State rights under the Constitution and in the Union; but State rights independent of the Union and above the Constitution. The constitution of the State of Georgia declares that treason consists in levying war against the State of Georgia, and in giving aid and comfort to her enemies. A citizen of the United States, for speaking or fighting in behalf of the General Government, could upon the theory of State rights be legally hung in Georgia upon the charge of treason. Such is the logical outcome of State rights. We thus reach the vital issue involved in this controversy, which at present perplexes and irritates the nation, namely, Shall the citizen be protected in his political rights? A part of the country says, Yes; another part just as emphatically says, No.

Said General Toombs, upon the floor of the convention that framed the present constitution of Georgia: "They [the freedmen] are to be governed, as every race of paupers is governed, by those who own the property and give them bread. . . . No inferior man, no man without civilization, has a chance in this race. . . . As his friends *tried to govern him by force and fraud*, WE WILL CONTROL HIM BY FORCE AND FRAUD, to prevent him from bringing ruin to us."

Our purpose is not to increase political irritation in saying that the force and fraud thus far employed by the South in governing the freedmen scarcely have a parallel in the world's history.

The Hon. Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, was employed by the Ku-klux of South Carolina to defend their brethren

in bonds. After listening to the evidence, he concluded the presentation of the case in these words:

"You have pleaded guilty to an indictment which charges you . . .

"We acknowledge great perplexity in determining what punishment shall be meted out to you. We have no words strong enough to signify our horror at the means employed. . . .

"You have, as it appears from your statements to the court, been brought up in the most deplorable ignorance. At the age of manhood, but one or two of you can either read or write, and you have lived in a community where the evidence seems to establish the fact that the men of prominence and education — those who by their superiority in these respects establish and control public opinion — were for the most part participants in the conspiracy, or so much in terror of it, that you could obtain from them neither protection nor advice, had you sought it.

"But what is quite as appalling to the court as the horrible nature of these offences, is the utter absence on your part, and on the part of others who have made confession here, of any sense of feeling that you have done anything very wrong.

"Some of your comrades recite the circumstances of a brutal, unprovoked murder, done by themselves, with as little apparent abhorrence as they would relate the incidents of a picnic, and you yourselves speak of the number of blows with a hickory which you inflicted at midnight upon the lacerated, bleeding back of a defenceless woman, without so much as a blush or sigh of regret. None of you seem to have the slightest idea of, or respect for, the sacred-

ness of the human person. Some of you have yourselves been beaten by the Klans without feeling a smart but the physical pain. There appears to be no wounding of the spirit, no such sense of injury to yourself as a *man*, as would be felt by the humblest of your fellow-citizens in any other part of the United States with which I am acquainted." These are facts, facts admitting of no denial, which may well lead every virtuous citizen, north and west, to say with Mark Antony when in presence of the dead Cæsar:

> "Oh, pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth,
> That I am meek and gentle with these butchers."

It must be admitted that if the General Government allows force and fraud in Georgia, then it must allow the same in Maine and in Oregon.

It must still further be acknowledged that one of the most serious matters involved in this controversy is, that the dogma of State Rights leads to the view that while treason is a possible crime in an individual state, it is not a possible crime while acting with a state against the government of the United States. All majesty is vested in the individual states, none in the federal compact, is the theory of our state and national governments which has been of late years practically carried out. That is, if treason is possible in the United States, then the Southern Rebellion was treason, and the chief secession leaders were traitors. And if traitors, then a heavy indictment ought to have followed their defeat. Yet those engaged in the rebellion have not been indicted for high crimes and misdemeanors, nor scarcely rebuked. Indeed, they have taken the place of special favorites. Says Senator Hill, of Georgia: "I do not know what else

may happen in the future, but this much I do know: come what may, the Southern people will never confess themselves traitors." And the North, by the course pursued, ought not henceforth to find fault with the senator from Georgia. It has been forcibly said, that "a traitor lives only to be abhorred, and we submit that the appointment of Confederate generals to important Federal offices, the reception given to them by the people of the North, the honors paid in Congress to the vice-president of the Confederacy, which are only illustrations of Northern sentiment, preclude us from denouncing secessionists as traitors."

Only sixteen years ago the rebellion was crushed. Since that time, men who led in that rebellion investigated in Congress the title of the present chief Executive. Can men exercising such functions any longer be called traitors? They are controlling both branches of Congress. Unrebuked they have used insolent language against those who spilt their blood and poured out their treasures to preserve the Union. Can men who are permitted to do this be called, with any propriety, traitors? We are allowing the country to pass into the hands of men who fought against it, and we are allowing the Treasury keys to pass into hands that not long since rifled the Treasury vaults for funds to wage war against the Union. Can we call such honored national favorites, traitors? The people of the North should have some respect for the laws of consistency.

What if an organized army did march against the national capital, and aim its shots against a fort upon which was flying the national flag? Though these acts would have been treason if committed against the State of Georgia, how can the General Government with any propriety speak

the word Treason? Treason! that word henceforth must not be spoken. The Meridian (Miss.) *Mercury* asks that Jefferson Davis, "the greatest of living American statesmen," be sent back to the United States senate, not to add to his fame, but that in his declining years he may "do noble service for the people of the United States." What ground of objection can there be, since he never has been a traitor? At a memorial-day celebration in Macon, Georgia, the following letter from Jefferson Davis was read and applauded:

"Let not any of the survivors impugn their faith by offering the penitential plea that they believed they were right. Let posterity learn by this monument that you commemorated men who died in a defensive war. These men strove for the state sovereignty which their fathers left them, and which it was their duty, if possible, to transmit to their children? Let this monument teach that heroism derives its lustre from the justice of the cause in which it is displayed, and let it mark the difference between a war waged for the purpose of conquest, and one to repel invasion, to defend a people's hearths and altars, and to maintain their laws and liberties. Such was the war in which our heroes fell, and theirs is the crown which sparkles with the gems of patriotism and righteousness."

That letter places the Confederate above the Union soldier. In the name of humanity, we may wish to protest; but how can we, since there has been no treason, and since there have been no traitors in the United States of America?

Now the most painful reflection, in all this matter, is the helpless condition in which the General Government has placed itself. Its hands are tied, its feet are manacled.

Other nations can protect themselves against treason, and defend the political rights of their citizens; our government cannot. If, anon, some other arm shall be raised to strike down the flag from some other Fort Sumter, it will have nothing to fear. A second effort may be successful; if not, judging from the past, the highest emoluments of the nation will be given as a reward for raising the arm to strike down the flag. Papists may gain control of any state in the Union, ostracize all Protestant citizens, and defy the General Government.

The Mormons have a right to take possession of any state in the Union, and enact laws in support of their peculiar institutions, and the General Government will be utterly powerless to prevent it.

There may be a governor and council of some state in the near or remote future, who will have a larger following than Governor Garcelon and his council. If so, year after year they can continue to "count in" and "count out," and the General Government will be powerless to protect the citizens from this imposition and outrage. Such is the subtle and damaging doctrine which some day is to make our Federal compact of so little value as not to deserve the drawing of a single sword in its defence.

The author of this book was an officer in the Federal volunteer army during the rebellion. He with many others mourns to-day that so many of the noblest of his generation sacrificed their lives. No soldier is satisfied with what has been gained. Many of the surviving comrades have sworn that though state after state hereafter should rebel, they never again would draw the sword or shoulder the musket.[67]

Passing to other unpleasant phases of our national politics, we call attention, next, to the working of political, or rather, party machinery. Theoretically, the United States is a democratic representative republic; practically, it is under one of the worst types of oligarchy ever known in history. A country ruled by a few men who have personal interest in its welfare, especially if they are good and wise, may be wisely governed. A country ruled by rings, political or whiskey, will soon be unwisely governed. Men dream that they are free, and they cast into ballot-boxes bits of paper. But the thoughtful among us blush at the kind of slavery to which we are subjected. We would not be misunderstood. There are men in public office who are patriotic and devout; men who render service for which they never have been, and never will be, adequately compensated. We ought to honor such men. They are conscientiously trying to save our republican institutions. But most of this class are helpless. Personally they are the embodiment of integrity. But they are caught in the whirl, and cannot extricate themselves. They regret a fact of which they are fully conscious, that present political methods develop trickery and stunt statesmanship. They confess in private that it has taken so much time and attention to manage party machinery, that no energy is left for unfolding broad national and state policies.

George Washington foresaw this possibility, and in his "Farewell," with language quaint and formal, uttered his friendly warning: "I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you

in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally. This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our natures, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy. . . . . There is an opinion that parties, in free countries, are useful checks upon the administration of government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This, within certain limits, is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their actual tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume."

At the bottom of the most of the perils against which this "Farewell Address" warns us, lies what is termed our system of "party spoils." They are coming to be enormous, and, consequently, tempting. The political prizes in the United States are already far greater than in any of the extinct republics, and are greater than in all existing republics combined. In consequence, parties now exist principally to gain and hold this wealth of spoils. Party legislation is directed, not to secure the highest interests of the nation, but to obtain the completest party triumphs. Spoils,

and not the salvation of the republic, are what parties look for. Hence, not those who do most for the country at large, but those who do most for the party, are the men who are in demand. "The American people," some one has said, "care very little about politics, but a great deal about politicians." It would be nearer the truth to say that the American people care very little about wise statesmen, but a great deal about party managers. The trickster in politics, if successful, is applauded and crowned. That is, tenure of office depends upon carrying the next election. Election managers are, therefore, party favorites. If they succeed in changing the administration fifty millions of dollars in yearly salaries, change hands, and thousands of men change places. Washington turned out but eight men, Adams only four, Jefferson thirty-nine, but not one of them for political reasons, Madison nine, Munroe five, and the younger Adams only two, but Jackson six hundred and ninety.

With a democratic President at the next election, it is estimated that a hundred thousand men step into office, and a hundred thousand step out.[68] The party in power *must*, therefore, retain its ascendancy; the party out of power *must*, therefore, gain ascendancy. To manage party interests, to appropriate and distribute spoils, do not require statesmanship, hence parties have no need of statesmen. They are ignored. The office of statesman is declared forever vacant.

So much, therefore, depends upon carrying "the election," that there is no hesitation in resorting to measures the most dastardly and corrupt. The maxim of Daniel O'Connell, that "nothing can be politically right which is morally

wrong," is ignored as antiquated nonsense. That this condition should destroy the manhood of many who remain long in political life, need not be thought surprising. In his *Imaginary Conversations*, Landor makes one of his characters, while talking of the Italian language, say, "*Governare* means to *govern*, and to *wash the dishes*." "This, indeed," continues Landor, "is not so absurd at bottom; for there is generally as much dirty work in the one as in the other." [69] Therefore, should a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Massachusetts, in order to gain Southern favor, move to pension rebel soldiers, or should a member of the Senate from the State of Maine, in order to secure the favor of the Pacific States, offer a tirade against the inoffensive Chinese, no one ought to be surprised. Such are the natural products of our political education. To demand a higher order of politicians in a republic one hundred years old, might be unreasonable.

And for the same reason it need not be a matter of surprise that, upon the eves of an election, national, state, or municipal, competing candidates are seen crowding lately-arrived foreigners to the naturalizing offices, and to the rooms of the tax-collectors; nor that they furnish the needed funds; and then, to gain some petty office, place the sacred ballot in the hands of men who have as yet nothing entitling them to American citizenship. More than one republic has been wrecked upon this rock. Such corruption, in the profoundest sense, is treason. There is said to be a man now in Congress "who bought two hundred and fifty votes, and was carried into office by them; and he kept a list of the men he bought, and used to show it to his friends as a matter of pride." This is despicable beyond estimate. But

who are the strict party men with conduct clean enough, or courage daring enough, to pronounce the deserved condemnation? Indeed, what is chiefly astonishing, is that the mass of our citizens look upon these party transactions with either a stupid or jocose indifference. If good men should protest, or should argue that the interests of native-born citizens are not so divergent as to justify resort to such hazardous measures for carrying an election, they would be laughed at.

This degraded and degrading party-work has contaminated nearly the whole body politic. Not only our foreign population is bought and sold like heaps of rubbish, but the poor of our native citizenship show the effects of this political malaria. Laboring-men, who ought to be far beyond the reach of these party crimes and corruptions, put down among their yearly assets, receipts from politicians to whom they have sold their votes. "I was told by a leading politician the other day," says a close student of these matters, "that when he put the question to a democratic manager, 'How many of your day-laborers, minor mechanics, and men of small means, refuse to be bought?' he replied, 'Not over a third. In a close election we can buy two-thirds of all the votes cast by the unfortunate class.'"

What adds to the political misfortunes of our country, is the fact that many upright citizens have become despondent, and are withdrawing from the field of politics. This is a most lamentable type of secession. Men who ought to be in our halls of state and national legislation, and men who ought to control preliminary political meetings, are tired of the ingratitude and abuse which attend civic services. Daniel Webster, shortly before his death, said to

a friend: "If I were to live my life over again, with my present experience, I would under no circumstances, and from no considerations, allow myself to enter public life. The public are ungrateful. The man who serves the public most faithfully receives no adequate reward. In my own history, those acts which have been before God the most disinterested and the least stained by selfish considerations, have been precisely those for which I have been most freely abused. No, no! have nothing to do with politics. Sell your iron; eat the bread of independence; support your family with the rewards of honest toil; do your duty as a private citizen to your country — but let politics alone. It is a hard life, a thankless life."

This political despair and indifference have been under quite general condemnation. It was one of the singular regulations of Solon, which declared a man dishonored and disfranchised who, in civil dispute, stood aloof and took no part with either side. When important measures were pending in Athens, servants of the state were sent through the market-place with a rope chalked red; and whoever received a stain on his toga, as that line passed along the crowded ways, was pronounced an enemy of the state and fined.

President Woolsey tells us that in our colonial days there were portions of New England in which votes were sent to householders; and if they did not use them they were fined.

Louis Kossuth says that *idiot* is a word of Greek extraction, and meant with the Greeks a man who cared nothing for the public interest.

It is told that when, some years ago, a delegation of Spanish students went to present an address to Victor Hugo,

the great French novelist and poet, they said they honored and revered him, but did not come to him as a politician. He exclaimed: "As a politician I wish to be known more than anything else, for every honest man ought to be a politician."

Charles Sumner often affirmed that the citizen who neglects his political duties is a public enemy.

Says Edmund Burke: "When bad men combine, the good must associate; else they will fall, one by one, an unpitied sacrifice, in a contemptible struggle."

In our republic, it is repeatedly urged that clergymen and all upright citizens should attend the ward and other preliminary meetings, and thus reform the political life of the nation. Dr. Dale, when in this country, went so far as to say to an audience in New Haven, that any citizen who is able to vote and does not vote, ought, if he is a member of the church, to be expelled from it.

The reply to all this is, that before compelling men to engage in politics, political traducers should be put under arrest, or be forced to keep silent. The American atmosphere is so loaded with indiscriminate abuse, heaped alike upon the most unprincipled demagogues and the most public-spirited citizens, that sensitive men hesitate to expose themselves. No worse things are said of the worst criminals than are published respecting some of the most patriotic servants of the nation. If the secular press can be believed, including the organs of different political parties, there is not an upright public man living. Only the dead in our republic are praised. It is this inflamed and reckless, this threatening and abusive language of the press and the political platform, which gives zest to the

bar-room and club-room meetings. It furnishes the political venom for the knots at street-corners, and for the secret caucus, and excites to communistic and revolutionary utterances.[70] It was one of the wise provisions of Lycurgus, in Sparta, that no evil speaking should be allowed. There is needed a public censor in America, who, with "a scourge of small cords," shall drive from our civic temple all who, for political effect, dare speak against an American citizen words that are evil and slanderous.

Not only do many of our upright citizens shrink from being targets for all sorts of abuse the moment they take any prominent part, but they have the feeling that their efforts in the political arena will be impotent. If one is to sacrifice his reputation, there ought to be some compensation for it. If an upright candidate, who is pledged against moral evils, say the rum traffic, is nominated, then the party managers of corrupt or selfish aims will bolt at pleasure, and aid in the election of some political opponent who advocates the rum traffic. That has been repeatedly done in one of the leading states of the republic. And what is still worse, if corrupt political leaders need votes to carry out their schemes in opposition to any moral reform, they have all the advantage. They can make votes or buy them, while the moral and upright citizen cannot. In a word, it is the abusive language employed by professional politicians, the wrangling in all political bodies, the dishonest measures resorted to by unprincipled and hungry office-seekers, which are causing many men to despair of the future triumph of our free institutions, and are leading many of our best citizens to quietly withdraw from political

contests and antagonisms, and leave the country to its threatened fate.[71]

We may be still more explicit. The republican party has been abusive and corrupt, and ought to be punished, perhaps overthrown. The State of Pennsylvania, year after year, has been carried for the republican party by the fraudulent returns of the city of Philadelphia. Some of the eastern and western states have records equally disgraceful.

But let it ever be borne in mind that it will not mend matters to have the republican party punished and overthrown by the democracy. The monstrous legislation since Congress has been under the control of the democrats, can hardly be matched by that of any extinct republic, even in its most degenerate days. The sanctimonious professions of the democracy are remarkable, indeed can hardly be equalled.[72]

Democratic leaders plead most zealously and magnanimously for "the rights of the people to elective franchise," and then, by violence and bloodshed, disfranchise hundreds of thousands of our legal voters. They plead for purity in all election matters, and then attempt, by the scandalous "counting-out" process, to defraud a New England state of her chosen representatives.

There is no question but it was through *fraud* that Governor Hayes was placed in the Presidential chair. There is no denying the fact that the democratic party has abundant ground for complaint that the actual vote cast in the late Presidential election, though clearly in their favor, was overruled by a partisan republican commission. But on the other hand, there can be no question that it would have

been an infinitely greater *fraud*, because coupled with tyranny, had Governor Tilden assumed control of the government. In that case, the republican party would have had equally abundant ground for complaint, that her overwhelming majorities were denied the rights of franchise by an armed and murderous democracy. In view of what has passed, republican leaders now appear in readiness to resort to any means, however questionable, which shall secure a republican President. Democratic leaders now swear that violence and revolution shall be resorted to before they will again be cheated of the Presidency. Both parties are determined — equally so. Hence many thoughtful people have the feeling that a President henceforth cannot be elected in the United States except by a combination of violence or fraud. There is a well-nigh universal dread of some outbreak at the next Presidential election. At a public reception of a governor of Massachusetts, President Seelye quotes a military officer of high position as expressing the opinion, that in the United States we have had our last President elected by the people.

Alexander Hamilton in 1787 wrote to a friend: "You and I may not live to see the day, but most assuredly it will come, when every vital interest of the state will be merged in the all-absorbing question, 'Who shall be our next President?'"[73]

Chancellor Kent made a prediction, fifty years ago, that the greatest test to the strength of our form of government would be connected with a Presidential election. Will it be the next?

The famous Florentine, Machiavelli, says of the Roman republic, that its continuance through so many years was

purely in virtue of this item in her constitution: that when affairs were approaching wreck, a dictator could be elected, "armed with autocratic power to strike down any dangerous person or combination of persons promptly and mercilessly." The Constitution of the United States, for the purification of her social and political system, has at present no such provision. To ask for such an amendment would now seem treasonable, but some day may be a necessity. For when the mass of our native-born and order-abiding citizens feel that their liberties are bartered away; that intrigue and conspiracy have taken the place of honest counsel; that government has passed from patriots to demagogues, and is little else than "a chaos with ballot-boxes," then there need be no surprise should the demand, more than once heard in the history of republics, be urgently repeated, for some one to seize the reins of government until there is restored what are lost — law and order. But upon that day will end the glory and the grandeur of the American republic.

Amid all this darkness, the reader asks, Is there no ray of light? Certainly there is light, and there are within reach the grandest possibilities for the future. Except for the evils recounted, ours is the best country and government on the globe. The material resources of the United States are well-nigh marvellous, while those of many of the old countries are felt to be limited. We have every facility for outstripping all other nations. Our civil freedom, our home comforts, our educational advantages, our opportunities for professional distinction and for political pre-

ferment, are beyond estimate; they are immense, immeasurable. But opportunities for national aggrandizement, however great, and other possibilities within our scope, however grand, unless rightly used, are not of the slightest account. To make available these opportunities and possibilities, there is needed the introduction of something into our social and political affairs not yet generally insisted upon. It is something which can quiet the conflicts between capital and labor, which can make capital more benevolent and labor more law-abiding, and in hard times more patient. It is something which can educate and develop the child so that he will become a national defender rather than a national destroyer; something which can harmonize the naturally conflicting interests between North and South, East and West; something which can make each party and each territorial section a means of security to the common republic, instead of being a threatening factor in our national existence.

What is that something? Has the political press yet spoken of it? Has it been heard in any of the political speeches of either party? Will it be inserted into the platforms of either of the political parties during the autumn campaigns? Will it be made an issue before any state or national legislature? This something, which will heal all our social and political maladies, is not the redistribution of property, nor better wages for the laborer, nor greenbacks for currency, nor changes in tariffs and taxation. Not one, not all these combined, can save the republic. Nor will the ballot given to women be the salvation of this country. In one of the leading towns of Massachusetts, within ten miles of Boston, in a late election of school committee, the

women, under the leadership of the wife of a United States officer, to secure one lady member on the committee, traded off their entire vote to the Irish Roman Catholics of the town.

Nor does our safety consist in the triumph of the republican, nor in the defeat of the democratic party. It is not Rutherford B. Hayes retained in the Presidential chair, nor General Grant restored to it, nor Ex-Governor Tilden out of it, nor any named or unnamed republican candidate elected to it, that can save the republic. The only thing that can save the United States from the fatality of historic republics is Biblical Christianity among the masses of the people. Let every man love God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself, and then our national woes will end, and our republic will be as enduring as the granite foundations of our continent. But without Bible knowledge and practice among the people — the people who cast the ballot, and the people who make and execute the laws — our country soon will not be fit to live in, nor our boasted liberties worth preserving. Except for a stream of healthy blood which has been sent into the national arteries by devout Christian workers, by men in the pulpit, by men in business and professional circles, by the humblest Sunday-school worker who meets his class on the Lord's day and implants in the mind of some boy religious obligations — yes, but for this our doom had already been sealed.

When the great intelligent head and the great patriotic heart of native-born Americans shall honor and cleave to Bible faith and practice, then nothing can harm us; all the manifest and occult forces of the universe will conspire to help. We could invite the suffering and overcrowded of

every nationality on earth to our shores, and still be secure. We could almost disband our army and retire our navy, and still be secure. We could extend our territories, taking in the Canadas, Cuba, Mexico, and Central America. We could do and bear much more than all this even, and still be secure. Lost confidence would be restored between man and man. Capital would become generous and the laborer would become faithful. Foreign and native elements would be Christianized, and harmonized. The tramp, the socialist, and the communist would disappear, and every man would be a royal son of God. The New Englander, the Westerner, and the Southerner would clasp hands, in a fraternity which has in it no misgiving nor deceit. Loyalty would be supreme, — supreme in the North, supreme in the West, and supreme in the South; and we should be safe — safe against *invasions*, safe against *insurrections*, safe against *usurpations*; nay, with such protections and inspirations, our security and prosperity would lift this nation into royal heights and into a superb atmosphere, so that people far and near would say, "Behold the kingdom of God is established on the earth."

But the mass of our people will not honor Bible law and practice. Men will remain unrighteous. The invisible forces of the universe, sometimes called God, which countenance nothing but righteousness, will demand a day of reckoning. The blow will fall. Nothing human is found to be permanent. When the timbers of the republic are crashing, good men will look up. The stars overhead will be calm and beautiful.

NOTES.

NOTES.

I. (Page 6.)

Says Jahn, in his "Biblical Archæology":

"From the circumstance that the people possessed so much influence as to render it necessary to submit laws to them for their ratification, and that they even took it upon themselves sometimes to propose laws, or to resist those which were enacted; from the circumstance, also, that the legislature of the nation had not the power of laying taxes, and that the civil code was regulated and enforced by God himself, independently of the legislature, Lowman and John David Michaelis are in favor of considering the Hebrew government a democracy. In support of their opinion, such passages are examined as the following: Exod. xix. 7, 8; xxiv. 3–8. Comp. Deut. xxix. 9–14; Josh. ix. 18, 19; xxiii. 1 *et seq.*; xxiv. 2 *et seq.*; 1 Sam. x. 24; xi. 14, 15; Num. xxvii. 1–8; xxxvi. 1–9. The truth seems to lie between these two opinions. The Hebrew government, putting out of view its theocratical features, was of a mixed form, in some respects approaching to a democracy, in others assuming more of an aristocratical character."

II. (Page 6.)

In support of the foregoing statements, compare, Judges iv. 4; Deut. i. 12–18, xxii. 23; Judges vi. 15; Deut. xxiv. 13; Lev. xix. 9, 14, 23.

III. (Page 7.)

"Moses enacted a law to the effect (Exod. xxii. 25; Lev. xxv. 35–38) that interest should not be taken from a *poor* person, neither for *borrowed money*, nor for articles of consumption — for instance, *grain* — which was borrowed with the expectation of being returned. A

difficulty arose in determining who was to be considered *a poor person* in a case of this kind; and the law was accordingly altered in Deut. xxiii. 20, 21, and extended in its operation to all the Hebrews, whether they had more or less property; so that interest could be lawfully taken only of foreigners.

"The Hebrews were, therefore, exhorted to lend money, &c., as a deed of mercy and brotherly kindness. (Deut. xv. 7–11; xxiv. 13.) And hence it happens that we find encomiums everywhere lavished upon those who were willing to lend without insisting upon interest for the use of the thing lent. (Ps. xv. 15; xxxvii. 21, 26; cxii. 6. Prov. xix. 17. Ezek. xviii. 8.)"—JAHN'S *Archæology*.

IV. (Page 7.)

In the second year after the Exodus there was an enrolment of all males between twenty and fifty years of age, who were able to bear arms. Another enrolment was made in the fortieth year after the Exodus.

The design of a subsequent enrolment under David appears to have been to reduce the whole of the people to military servitude.

V. (Page 14.)

Milton's remarkable description of Athens is found in "Paradise Regained":

> "Look once more, ere we leave this specular mount,
> Westward; much nearer by southwest behold,
> Where, on the Ægean shore, a city stands,
> Built nobly; pure the air, and light the soil;
> Athens, the eye of Greece, mother of arts
> And eloquence, native to famous wits,
> Or hospitable, in her sweet recess,
> City or suburban, studious walks and shades.
> See there the olive grove of Academe,
> Plato's retirement, where the Attic bird
> Trills her thick-warbled notes the summer long;
> There flowery hill Hymettus, with the sound
> Of bees' industrious murmur, oft invites
> To studious musing: there Ilissus rolls
> His whispering stream: within the walls then view
> The schools of ancient sages; his who bred
> Great Alexander to subdue the world,
> Lyceum there, and painted Stoa next."

VI. (Page 16.)

The following are representative descriptions of the condition of Greece in the sixteenth century:

"Gerbel, in a work published in the middle of the sixteenth century, in speaking of Athens, exclaims: 'O tragic change of human power! a city once surrounded by walls, filled with edifices, powerful in arms and wealth and men, now reduced to a miserable village; once free and living under its own laws, now subjected by the yoke of slavery to the most cruel and brutal masters. Go to Athens, and behold, in place of the most magnificent works, a mass of deplorable ruins.' And Pinet, a French writer, at the close of his description, exclaims: 'And now, O heavens! there remains only a little castle, and a miserable village, unprotected from foxes and wolves, and other wild beasts.' Another writer, a little later, says: 'Greece once was, Athens once was; now there is neither Athens in Greece, nor Greece in Greece itself.' And Ortelius, the geographer, says: 'Now only a few miserable huts remain; the place at the present day is called Setine.'" — SMITH'S *History of Greece.*

Says a recent visitor: "The amalgamation of races, and the loss of national incentives, have rendered the people so shabby and sluggish, so careless and aimless, so degraded and squalid, that we wonder how their ancestors could have listened to the recital of Homer's poems, or fought with Miltiades and Themistocles, or encouraged Pericles, or reverenced Socrates and Plato, or have become enraptured by the eloquence of Demosthenes."

VII. (Page 16.)

Plutarch, in his "Customs of the Lacedæmonians," clearly sets forth this thought:

"For though great riches and large possessions were things they hated to death, it being a capital crime and punishment to have any gold or silver in their houses, or to amass up together heaps of money (which was generally made with them of iron or leather), for which reason several had been put to death, according to that law which banished covetousness out of the city, on the account of an answer of their oracle to Alcamenes and Theopompus, two of their Spartan kings, 'that the love of money should be the ruin of Sparta,' yet, notwithstanding the severe penalty annexed to the heaping up much wealth, and the example of those who had suffered for it, Lysander was highly honored and rewarded for bringing in a quantity of gold

and silver to Lacedæmon, after the victory he had gained over the Athenians, and the taking of the city of Athens itself, wherein an inestimable treasure was found. So that what had been a capital crime in others was a meritorious act in him. It is true, indeed, that as long as the Spartans did adhere closely to the observation of the laws and rules of Lycurgus, and kept their oath religiously to be true to their own government, they outstripped all the other cities of Greece for prudence and valor, and for the space of five hundred years became famous everywhere for the excellency of their laws and the wisdom of their policy. But when the honor of these laws began to lessen, and their citizens grew luxurious and exorbitant; when covetousness and too much liberty had softened their minds and almost destroyed the wholesome constitution of their state, their former greatness and power began by little and little to decay and dwindle in the estimation of men."

VIII. (Page 17.)

Aristophanes thus describes the character of one of these degenerate Athenian political leaders:

"The character of popular leader no longer belongs to a man of education, nor yet to one good in his morals, but to the ignorant and repulsive."

"'How am I to manage the people?' asks the sausage-seller in the 'Knights.' 'That is very easy,' replied Demosthenes; 'act as you do now. Jumble and mince together all state affairs, and always win over the people to your side by coaxing them with little, corkish words. But the other requisites for a demagogue you possess, — a vulgar tongue; you are of mean birth, a low fellow. You have all things requisite for statesmanship.'"

IX. (Page 18.)

These generals opposed each other with such violent animosity that Aristides is reported to have said: "If the Athenians were wise, they would cast both of us into the barathrum."

X. (Page 19.)

Thirlwald gives the following definition of a Grecian *tyrant* or *despot*: "The irresponsible dominion of a single person, not founded on hereditary right, or on fair election."

The aggressive and cruel sway of some of the despots is illustrated in a story told by Periander:

"Soon after his accession, he is said to have sent to Thrasybulus, despot of Miletus, to ask him for advice as to the best mode of maintaining his power. Without giving an answer in writing, Thrasybulus led the messenger through a corn-field, cutting off, as he went, the tallest ears of corn. He then dismissed the messenger, telling him to inform his master how he had found him employed. The action was rightly interpreted by Periander, who proceeded to rid himself of the powerful nobles of the state."

XI. (Page 21.)

The picture of one of these woful political epochs is thus vividly portrayed by the national historian, Thucydides:

"Discord then reigned throughout the states. . . . . And they changed the customary meaning of words applied to things, according to the caprices of the moment; for reckless audacity was considered manly fidelity to party; prudent delay, fair-seeming cowardice; moderation, the screen for feebleness. Headlong frenzy was set down on the side of manhood. The unrelenting was trusted; whoever argued against him was suspected. He who plotted, if successful, was thought sagacious; who counterplotted, still abler. He who forecasted the means whereby he should not need these resorts was charged with ruining the party and fearing their opponents. In a word, he was applauded who got the start of another when intending to do an injury, and who induced one to do a wrong that had no thought of doing it himself. And what was worse, kin became more alien than party, because party was prompter for unscrupulous daring. For such combinations aim not for the benefit of the established institutions, but in their grasping spirit run counter to the lawful authorities. Their pledges to one another were sanctioned, not by divine law, but by their having together violated law. The cause of this state of things was the lust of power, for purposes of rapacity and ambition, and the hot temper of those who were engaged in the conflict. Thus neither party held to sacred honor; but those were more highly spoken of who, under cover of plausible pretences, succeeded in effecting some purpose of hatred. The citizens who stood between the extremes, and belonged to neither, both parties endeavored to destroy. So every species of wickedness became established by these feuds over the Hellenic world. Simplicity of character, wherein nobleness of nature most largely shares, being scoffed at, disappeared; and mutual opposition of feeling, with universal distrust, prevailed. For there was neither binding word nor fearful oath to compose the strife. And for the most part, those who were meaner in understanding were the more

successful; for, fearing their own deficiency and the ability of their adversaries, apprehensive that they should be worsted in argument and eloquence, and outwitted by the intellectual adroitness on the other side, they went audaciously on to deeds of violence; but their opponents, contemptuous in the presumption of foreknowledge, and not feeling the need of securing by action what could be compassed by genius, the more easily perished undefended."

XII. (Page 27.)

This is an elegiac fragment of a poem translated by Professor Felton, and written by the Grecian lawgiver Solon, seemingly to warn the people against the arts of aspiring demagogues.

XIII. (Page 29.)

"In the great African republic, bank-notes had their origin. 'In a small piece of leather,' says Æschines, the Socratic philosopher, 'is wrapped a substance of the size of a piece of four drachms; but what this substance is, no one knows except the maker. After this, it is sealed and issued for circulation; and he who possesses the most of this is regarded as having the most money, and as being the wealthiest man. But if any one among us had ever so much, he would be no richer than if he possessed a quantity of pebbles.' Of course banks must have existed for the redemption of these leather promises to pay, and the issue and currency of such notes must have been provided for by law." — MANN'S *Ancient and Mediæval Republics*.

XIV. (Page 34.)

It was the custom of Hannibal to have with him in his campaigns two Greek men of letters for the purpose of recording his exploits. But this plan which Hannibal had formed for giving to posterity the facts of his campaigns, as Julius Cæsar did after him, was frustrated; the manuscripts were probably destroyed by the Roman conquerors. The solitary relic of Carthaginian literature that the world possesses is a work on agriculture by Mago. It was translated into Latin, and in that form became the standard Latin classic on agriculture.

Æmilianus, the commanding general of the Roman army which conquered Carthage, was greatly inclined to spare what remained of this stately metropolis, after being plundered by the soldiers. He therefore wrote to the senate, from which he received the following orders: "1. The city of Carthage, with Byrsa and Megalia, shall be entirely destroyed, and no traces of them left. 2. All the cities which

have lent Carthage any assistance shall be dismantled. 3. The territories of those cities which have declared for the Romans shall be enlarged with the lands taken from the enemy. 4. All the lands between Hippo and Carthage shall be divided among the inhabitants of Utica. 5. All the Africans of the Carthaginian state, both men and women, shall pay an annual tribute to the Romans at so much per head. 6. The whole country formerly subject to the Carthaginian state shall be reduced into a Roman province, and be governed by a prætor, in the same manner as Sicily. Lastly, Rome shall send commissioners into Africa, there to settle jointly with the proconsul the state of the new province."

XV. (Page 37.)

Montesquieu thought that the greatness of Rome was due to her first great leaders, Romulus, Numa, and others. More modern theorists believed that it was rather owing to her unsurpassed and commanding situation, and to the abundant and admirable building materials about her. We may more safely attribute Roman greatness to a union of the military spirit, the greatness of her early leaders, and to her grand geographical and topographical situation.

XVI. (Page 38.)

Of the habits of the people of Rome during the early period of the republic, Schmitz says:

"Rustic pursuits produced and nourished the highest virtues that characterized the best of the Romans; and the greatest praise that a censor could bestow upon a man was, that he was a good husbandman and father. Their mode of living still continued to be extremely simple: their ordinary food consisted of a kind of porridge made of flour, and fruit of the fields. Bread was made at home by the women. In the time of the Samnite wars, wine was thought so precious that even the libations to the gods consisted of mere drops of wine; and one Mecenius was not censured for having killed his wife because she had drunk wine without his knowing it."

XVII. (Page 40.)

The triumphal processions in honor of a Roman victory were among the grandest displays of the republic. The historian thus describes the triumph of Paulus after the victory of Pydna:

"First passed the sports of Greece, statues and pictures, in two hundred and fifty wagons; then the arms and accoutrements of the

Macedonian soldiers; then three thousand men, each carrying a vase of silver coin; then victims for sacrifice, with youths and maidens with garlands; then men bearing vases of gold and precious stones; then the royal chariot of the conquered king, laden with armor and trophies; then his wife and children and the fallen monarch on foot; then the triumphal car of the victorious general, preceded by men bearing four hundred crowns of gold, the gift of Grecian cities, and followed by his two sons on horseback, and the whole army in order."

XVIII. (Page 40.)

"At their repasts," says Schmitz, "the most exquisite dishes were brought together from all parts of the world; and in order not to be restrained in their extravagant enjoyment of them, they had recourse to the disgusting practice of taking emetics both before and after their debauches."

XIX. (Page 41.)

Says a careful student of Roman affairs:

"Italian agriculture, which had received its death-blow during the latter period of the republic, was completely crushed by the establishment of numerous villas, which, with their parks and pleasure-grounds, baths, ponds, and groves, often equalled large towns in extent; and most of the remaining districts were changed into pasture land. Manufactures and industry could not thrive at Rome from the want of an active and industrious middle class; the Romans being either enormously wealthy, or living in abject poverty. In the reign of tyrants, the populace were never under the necessity of working, or gaining their living by honest labor; for the means of subsistence, as oil, bread, wine, and meat, were lavishly distributed among them by the rulers, either from the public treasury or from their private purse. A country which had once become a Roman province gradually fell into decay; for a number of wealthy strangers or Roman speculators usually settled in it, and purchased the lands at reduced prices. Hence the number of land-owners in Sicily was fearfully small in the time of Cicero; and those few, who had accumulated all the land, had it cultivated by hordes of slaves, while the free inhabitants were reduced to abject poverty."

XX. (Page 42.)

A volume of testimonies could be compiled, setting forth the extreme moral corruption of the closing days of the republic and the beginning of the empire. Note the following:

"The age of our fathers," says Horace, "worse than that of our grandsires, has produced us, who are yet baser, and who are doomed to give birth to a still more degraded offspring."

"Posterity," says Juvenal, "will add nothing to our immorality: our descendants can but do and desire the same crimes as ourselves."

"More crime," says Seneca, "is committed than can be remedied by restraint; wickedness has prevailed so completely in the breast of all, that innocence is not rare, but non-existent."

XXI. (Page 44.)

Henry Mann correctly remarks that "the beginning of the decay of the Roman commonwealth may be dated from the time when the soldier began to be distinct from the citizen. The growth of this distinction was gradual. As the area of military operations extended, campaigns were more protracted, and the influence of the central government over the forces in the field became weaker and weaker. Even if a commander started out with no ambitious designs against the liberties of his country, he could not but learn, during years of supreme authority over legions and over provinces, to love the exercise of absolute power. His men too, cut off from home communications and sympathies, were ready to follow a leader who they knew would reward them. They forgot that they were in the service of the commonwealth, and listened only to the chief whom they had been accustomed to obey, and on whose gratitude they felt that they could rely."

XXII. (Page 45.)

"Previous to the time of Clodius, citizens receiving corn at the public charge were required to pay an almost nominal sum for it, but that demagogue introduced a law providing that corn should be distributed gratis. Many frauds and irregularities resulted, which Julius Cæsar rectified by requiring the landlords of every square, or island, as the Romans termed separate blocks of buildings, to furnish a correct list of their tenants. The number fed was thus reduced from three hundred and twenty thousand to a hundred and fifty thousand, and a great saving was effected to the public treasury."

XXIII. (Page 45.)

"The gross brutality and total absence of every feeling of humanity in the population of Rome shows itself most strikingly in their passionate fondness for the bloody scenes of the circus: the sight of murder, and of men in the agonies of death, was to them a source of pleasure

and delight; and their cries for bread were often mixed with cries for murderous games. Even Titus was obliged to yield to the clamor of the people, and to give gladiatorial games for several days, in which thousands of unfortunate gladiators were compelled to destroy one another. In like manner, Trajan, after his Dacian victory, had to amuse the populace with games which lasted a hundred and three days, and which, in the number of gladiators and wild beasts that appeared in the circus, surpassed every similar exhibition seen at Rome. All imaginable instruments and artifices of sensuality, voluptuousness, and debauchery were carried from the East to Italy; and the city of Rome, which became a place of resort for persons of all nations, was at the same time a pool of corruption for all." — SCHMITZ'S *History of Rome.*

XXIV. (Page 48.)

"The fearful anarchy into which Rome was plunged after the time of Sulla showed itself more particularly in the assemblies of the people; for there the place of the free-born Roman citizen was occupied by an idle and hungry populace, which had no desire for anything higher than bread and amusements, and was ever ready to attach itself to those who had the richest rewards to offer. At the elections of magistrates, bribery was carried on in the most open and unscrupulous manner; and the dregs of the city, which fed upon bribery, decided upon the most important affairs of the state, such as the election of magistrates, the enactment of laws, and upon peace and war. The comitia often were of the most riotous and tumultuous kind, for the hostile factions not unfrequently attacked each other with arms; and the forum was the scene of civil bloodshed, bands of armed slaves and gladiators occupying it, and deciding by the dagger or the sword what ought to have been settled by free and rational discussion. The tribunes, who had been the representatives of the people and the guardians of their rights ever since the time of the Gracchi, either themselves came forward as the leaders of factions, or sold themselves as supporters to those who chose to buy them by bribes." — *Ibid.*

XXV. (Page 53.)

Plutarch, speaking of Cæsar's robbery of the treasury of Rome, says:

"As Metullus, the tribune, opposed his taking money out of the public treasury, and alleged some laws against it, Cæsar said, 'Arms and laws do not flourish together. If you are not pleased at what I am about, you have nothing to do but withdraw: indeed, war will not

bear much liberty of speech. When I say this I am departing from my own right: for you, and all whom I have found exciting a spirit of faction against me, are at my disposal.' Saying this, he approached the doors of the treasury, and as the keys were not produced, he sent for workmen to break them open. Metullus opposed him again, and some praised his firmness; but Cæsar, raising his voice, threatened to put him to death if he gave any further trouble. 'And, young man,' said he, 'you are not ignorant that this is harder for me to say than to do.' Metullus, terrified with his menace, retired, and afterwards Cæsar was easily and readily supplied with everything necessary for the war."

XXVI. (Page 53.)

De Quincy thus comments upon the relative rank of Cæsar:

"Was Cæsar, upon the whole, the greatest of men? Dr. Beattie once observed, that, if that question were left to be collected from the suffrages already expressed in books and scattered throughout the literature of all nations, the scale would be found to have turned prodigiously in Cæsar's favor, as against any single competitor; and there is no doubt whatever, that, even amongst his own countrymen and his own contemporaries, the same verdict would have been returned, had it been collected upon the famous principle of Themistocles, that *he* should be reputed the first whom the greatest number of rival voices had pronounced the second."

XXVII. (Page 55.)

In Ode XIV., Book I., Horace tried to persuade the Romans not to allow Augustus to abandon the government of the state, lest it should again be subjected to mob rule.

In Odes V. and XV., Book IV., and in the second book of his epistles, Epistle I., the poet suggests how helpless Rome would be if deprived of the strong hand of Augustus.

In Ode XVI. of the "Epodes," Horace shows that the republic was wrecked before Augustus came into power.

There appear to have been but two occasions subsequent to the empire of Augustus, when the people seriously thought of regaining their liberties. Tacitus, speaking of the condition of affairs after Augustus became emperor, says:

"The character of the government is totally changed; no traces were to be found of the spirit of ancient institutions. The system by which every citizen shared in the government being thrown aside, all men regarded the orders of the prince as the only rule of conduct and

obedience; nor felt they any anxiety for the present, while Augustus, yet in the vigor of life, maintained the credit of himself and house, and the peace of the state. But when old age had crept over him, and he was sinking under bodily infirmities; when his end was at hand, and thence a new source of hopes and views was presented, — some few there were who began to talk idly about the blessings of liberty; many dreaded a civil war, others longed for one; while far the greatest part were occupied in circulating various surmises reflecting upon those who seemed likely to be their masters."

The other occasion when a desire for independence showed itself was after the murder of Caligula. Gibbon, gathering the facts from Josephus, Dion, and Suetonius, says:

"There appears, indeed, *one* memorable occasion in which the senate, after seventy years of patience, made an ineffectual attempt to reassume its long-forgotten rights. When the throne was vacant by the murder of Caligula, the consuls convoked that assembly in the capital, condemned the memory of the Cæsars, gave the watchword 'liberty' to the few cohorts who faintly adhered to their standard, and during eight and forty hours acted as the independent chiefs of a free commonwealth. But while they deliberated, the prætorian guards had resolved. The stupid Claudius, brother of Germanicus, was already in their camp, invested with the imperial purple, and prepared to support his election by arms. The dream of liberty was at an end; and the senate awoke to all the horrors of inevitable servitude. Deserted by the people and threatened by a military force, that feeble assembly was compelled to ratify the choice of the prætorians, and to embrace the benefit of an amnesty, which Claudius had the prudence to offer and the generosity to observe."

XXVIII. (Page 65.)

Giovanni de Medici, a man of immense wealth, the banker of the pope, is regarded as the founder of the remarkable house of the Medici. At his death in 1428, he left two sons, Cosimo and Lorenzo, from the latter of whom the dukes of the sixteenth century descended. Cosimo acquired great distinction during the council of Florence in 1439, and his grandson, Lorenzo the Magnificent, added still more to the fame of the house. In 1478 the conspiracy of the Pazzi against the Medici failed, and in 1492 Pietro succeeded his father Lorenzo as gonfaloniere. Pietro subsequently was expelled, and Savonarola established a kind of theocracy which ended in 1498. By the victory of Alessandro of Medici (August 12, 1530), the republic was completely overthrown, and (July 29, 1531) Alessandro was declared duke of Florence. He was killed in 1539, and his son succeeded as grand-duke.

XXIX. (Page 65.)

"In Italy," says Signor Ricotti, "the free companies were for two centuries the sole military force of the country. In fact, at the very moment, as it were, of their appearance, the communal governments began to decay, the city military forces became extinct, and vast dominions were erected on the ruins caused by partisan zeal. . . . Thus in the earliest beginnings of the companies must be sought the solution of that most important problem — the cause of the decline of the Italian communes."

"One effect of the employment of mercenary troops in the duels between the Italian states of the mediæval period was to make the wars comparatively bloodless. In this respect, a battle between Italian armies in the middle ages resembled an encounter between the forces of South American revolutionists at the present time. 'Such cowardice and disorder prevailed in the armies of those times,' says Machiavelli, 'that the turning of a horse's head or tail was sufficient to decide the fate of an expedition.' The same author relates that in a hardly-contested battle (near Anghiari, 1439) between the Florentine forces under Micheletto Attendulo, and those of the duke of Milan under Niccolo Piccinino, — both of them famous captains in their day, — 'only one man died, and he not from wounds inflicted by hostile weapons, or any honorable means, but, having fallen from his horse, was trampled to death.' This battle lasted two hours. The aim of both parties was to gain possession of a bridge, which was repeatedly taken and retaken, so that it is difficult to imagine how in a hand-to-hand struggle in such a narrow place loss of life was avoided, unless, as was doubtless the fact, the combatants had no heart in their work, and did not wish to kill each other. It is narrated that in another battle between the Florentines and Venetians (near Imola, 1467), the two armies 'came to a regular engagement, which continued half a day, without either party yielding. Some horses were wounded and prisoners taken, but no death occurred.'" — *Mann.*

XXX. (Page 71.)

"The cells into which prisoners were thrown after being arrested were known as the *wells* and *leads*. The *wells* were dungeons beneath the level of the canal, and were so called because there was generally about two feet of sea-water in them. The wretched prisoner, if he did not care to soak his legs in the salt water, had to remain on the planks upon which his mattress was spread, and on which his daily meal of bread, soup, and water was laid. Unless he ate the food without

delay, enormous rats would devour it before his eyes. The *leads* were situated immediately beneath the leaden roof of the ducal palace. Casanova, who was immured in a Venetian dungeon in 1755, thus describes his experience : 'The jailer took a great key, and opened a door about three feet and a half in height, and plated with iron. In the middle of the door was an opening about eight inches square. On entering I saw an instrument of iron fastened to the wall. My guide, who noticed my surprise, said, with a smile, "The gentleman is not able, probably, to divine the use of that machine. When the illustrious Inquisition ordain that a prisoner be strangled, he is made to sit upon a stool, and an iron collar is put half round his neck. Then a silken cord is passed around his neck, the ends of which are attached to a crank, which is turned until the patient has given up the ghost; but the confessor does not leave him until he is dead." "What a contrivance!" I exclaimed; "probably it is you who have the honor to turn the crank." My amiable *cicerone* did not answer, and we passed on. The cells for prisoners of state were situated in the highest story under the top of the ducal palace. The roof is covered neither with slate nor tiles, but with sheets of lead about three feet square. The rays of the sun, falling directly upon the leaden roof of my dungeon, made it as hot as a stove. During the day I kept myself entirely naked, while the bench upon which I sat was wet with the streams of sweat that ran from my body. Air was admitted through an opening about two feet square, obstructed by six bars of iron, each an inch thick, which crossed each other. Innumerable swarms of insects caused me intolerable pain, and I dared not utter a word of complaint, lest I should be put down in the wells.'"

XXXI. (Page 73.)

Pisa is sometimes included in the list of free cities. Its origin and development are thus sketched by its historian:

"Of the origin of the ancient Pisae, which occupied the same site as the modern town, several traditions are given, but little is known with certainty: whether founded by Pelasgians, or, as the poets would have us to believe, by Greeks from the Elean Pisa; or, according to a third account, by Etruscans. It was at one time Etruscan; but its early fightings with the Ligurians, and its exploits in piracy and trade, are buried in the dim obscurity of those early times. We do not even know how, nor exactly when, Pisae became subject to the growing power of Rome. It certainly was a dependent ally of the republic before the second Punic war, and its port was used as a place of departure for Spain and Gaul. It was also for a long time the frontier

city against the Ligurians, and suffered frequently from the invasions of these people in their protracted wars with Rome. In 180 B. C., a colony was established here, and it soon became one of the most flourishing places in Etruria; but its history again became obscure in the decline of the Roman empire. It passed successively under the dominion of the Goths, Lombards, and Franks, when they conquered Italy; and subsequently became virtually an independent state, owing allegiance nominally to the marquises of Tuscany, who were vassals of the emperor. In this condition the city gradually rose to much importance, and maintained a fleet of galleys, which was employed with much success against the Mohammedan pirates on the coasts of the Mediterranean. They even went so far as to conquer, in 1022, the island of Sardinia, with the assistance of the Genoese, and afterwards that of Corsica, which they received in 1091 as a fief from the Papal See. This was the period of their greatest prosperity, when the city was decorated by its magnificent ecclesiastical edifices. For about four centuries Pisa was one of the most powerful maritime powers in the Mediterranean; but this high rank was lost in the course of the long wars with Genoa, which began in 1070, and resulted in the destruction of the harbor of Pisa in 1290. Meanwhile the city was also engaged in the wars between the Guelphs and Ghibellines in Italy. Pisa supported the latter, or imperial party, and was attacked by Florence, the head of the opposite side. It was in these contentions that Ugolino, Count Gherardesca, whose story has been rendered famous by Dante, after being for ten years captain-general of Pisa, was displaced by the Pisans for favoring the Guelph party, and died by starvation, with his sons and grandsons, in the Tower of Famine, which is still pointed out in the city. Peace was at last made with Florence in 1293, and with Genoa in 1299; and the city, now shorn of its naval power, afterwards lost by the same unhappy feuds its independence too. War soon after broke out anew, and Pisa had to contend single-handed against the whole power of Tuscany. In 1326 they lost Sardinia, after repeated attempts to retain it. But the city itself long held out against its foes, and was only reduced by domestic feuds and treachery under the power of Florence in 1406, the chief families proudly withdrawing to Sardinia and Sicily. On the French invasion in 1494, Pisa made a last effort for independence, but was a second time conquered by Florence in 1509. Its liberty was now lost forever, and it has continued since that time subject to Florence, whose fortunes it has shared."

XXXII. (Page 76.)

See M'Culloch's *Treatises on Economical Policy.*

XXXIII. (Page 78.)

The present condition of the free cities of Germany, as presented in "The Statesman's Year Book for 1880," is, in the main, the following:

I. Hamburg. — The present constitution of the city was published September 28, 1860, and came in force January 1, 1861. According to the terms of this constitution, the government is intrusted, in common, to two chambers of representatives, the senate and the house of burgesses. The senate, which exercises chiefly, but not entirely, the executive power, is composed of eighteen members, one-half of whom must have studied jurisprudence, while seven out of the remaining nine must belong to the class of merchants. The members of the senate are elected for life by the house of burgesses; but a senator is at liberty to retire at the end of six years. A first and second burgomaster, chosen annually by secret ballot, preside over the meetings of the senate. No burgomaster can be in office longer than two years; and no member of the senate is allowed to hold any other public office whatever. The house of burgesses consists of one hundred and ninety-two members, eighty-four of whom are elected in secret ballot by the votes of all tax-paying citizens. Of the remaining one hundred and eight members, forty-eight are chosen, also by ballot, by the owners of house property in the city valued at three thousand marks over and above the amount for which they are taxed; while the other sixty members are deputed by various guilds, corporations, and courts of justice. All the members of the house of burgesses are chosen for six years, in such a manner that every three years new elections take place for one-half the number. The house of burgesses is represented, in permanence, by a committee of the house, consisting of twenty deputies, of whom no more than five are allowed to be members of the legal profession. It is the special duty of the committee to watch the proceedings of the senate, and the general execution of the articles of the constitution, including the laws voted by the house of burgesses. In all matters of legislation, except taxation, the senate has a veto; and in case of a constitutional conflict, recourse is had to an assembly of arbitrators, chosen in equal parts from the senate and the house of burgesses.

The revenue of the state is mainly derived from direct taxes, chief among them an income-tax, the amount of which upon each contributor is left to self-assessment. For the privilege of remaining a "free port" and exempt from the customs of the Zollverein, Hamburg has to pay an annual sum, assessed for the year 1879 at two

million forty-six thousand marks, equal to a charge of thirty-seven dollars and fifty cents per head of population.

The state embraces a territory of one hundred and forty-eight English square miles, with a population, according to the census of December 1, 1876, of three hundred and eighty-eight thousand six hundred and eighteen inhabitants. Included in the census returns were two battalions of Prussian soldiers, forming the garrison of Hamburg. The state consists of three divisions, viz., the city proper, with its suburbs, the district of Geest, and the townships of Bergedorf and Ritzebüttel.

II. Lubeck. — The free city and state of Lübeck is governed according to a constitution adopted April 7, 1874. The main features of this charter are two representative bodies, — the senate, exercising the executive, and the house of burgesses, exercising the legislative authority. The senate is composed of fourteen members, elected for life, and presided over by two burgomasters, who hold office for two years each, and retire in rotation. There are one hundred and twenty members in the house of burgesses, chosen by all citizens who are members of any of the twelve colleges, or guilds, of the town. A committee of thirty burgesses, presided over by a chairman elected for two years, has the duty of representing the legislative assembly in the intervals of ordinary sessions, and of carrying on all active business. The house of burgesses has the initiative in all measures relative to public expenditures, foreign treaties, and general legislation. The senate, intrusted chiefly with the executive government, also gives its sanction to the enactment of every new law.

The high court of appeal for the three free cities of Germany is established at Lübeck. It is composed of a president nominated by the senates of the three free cities, and six councillors, three of whom are chosen by Hamburg, two by Bremen, and one by Lübeck.

Lübeck has an area of one hundred and twenty-seven square miles, and a population of fifty-six thousand nine hundred and twelve.

III. Bremen. — This city, embracing an area of a hundred and six square miles, is governed under a constitution proclaimed March 5, 1849, and revised February 21, 1854. A senate of eighteen members forms the executive, and the convent of burgesses, of one hundred and fifty members, the legislative branches of the government. The members of the convent are elected by the votes of all the citizens, divided into classes. The citizens who have studied at a university return sixteen members; the merchants forty-eight members; the common traders and shopkeepers twenty-four members; and the other tax-paying inhabitants of the free city the rest. The convent elects

the eighteen members of the senate, ten of whom at least must be lawyers. Two burgomasters, the first elected for six years and a half, and the second for four years, direct the affairs of the senate, through a ministry divided into eight departments, namely, foreign affairs, church and education, justice, finance, police, medical and sanitary administration, military affairs, and commerce and shipping. All the ministers are senators.

The chief branch of expenditure of Bremen is for interest and reduction of the public debt. The whole of the debt, which bears interest at three and a half and four and a half per cent., was incurred for constructing railways, harbors, and other public works.

The population of the state amounted, December 1, 1875, to one hundred and forty-two thousand two hundred, inclusive of a Prussian garrison. The increase of population from 1871 to 1875 was larger than in any other state of Germany, amounting to the high rate of 3.82 per cent. per annum.

XXXIV. (Page 85.)

The picture of those disturbed times, and the faithfulness and greatness of Orange, as represented by Macaulay, are interesting and striking:

"While Temple was engaged in these pursuits, the great storm which had long been brooding over Europe burst with such fury as for a moment seemed to threaten ruin to all free governments and all Protestant churches. France and England, without seeking for any decent pretext, declared war against Holland. The immense armies of Lewis poured across the Rhine, and invaded the territory of the United Provinces. The Dutch seemed to be paralyzed by terror. Great towns opened their gates to straggling parties. Regiments flung down their arms without seeing an enemy. Guelderland, Overyssel, Utrecht were overrun by the conquerors. The fires of the French camp were seen from the walls of Amsterdam. In the first madness of despair, the devoted people turned their rage against the most illustrious of their fellow-citizens. De Ruyter was saved with difficulty from assassins. De Witt was torn to pieces by an infuriated rabble. No hope was left to the commonwealth save in the dauntless, the ardent, the indefatigable, the unconquerable spirit which glowed under the frigid demeanor of the young prince of Orange.

"That great man rose at once to the full dignity of his part, and approved himself a worthy descendant of the line of heroes who had vindicated the liberties of Europe against the house of Austria. Nothing could shake his fidelity to his country; not his close connection

with the royal family of England, not the most earnest solicitations, nor the most tempting offers. The spirit of the nation — that spirit which had maintained the great conflict against the gigantic power of Philip — revived in all its strength. Counsels, such as are inspired by a generous despair, and are almost always followed by a speedy dawn of hope, were gravely concerted by the statesmen of Holland. To open their dikes, to man their ships, to leave their country, with all its miracles of art and industry, its cities, its canals, its villas, its pastures, and its tulip gardens buried under the waves of the German ocean; to bear to a distant climate their Calvinistic faith and their old Batavian liberties; to fix, perhaps with happier auspices, the new stadthouse of their commonwealth, under other stars, and amidst a strange vegetation, in the Spice Islands of the Eastern seas, — such were the plans which they had the spirit to form; and it is seldom that men who have the spirit to form such plans are reduced to the necessity of executing them."

XXXV. (Page 91.)

Camille Desmoulins thus depicts the condition of France at this period:

"At the present epoch, words became state crimes; and from this the transition is easy to simple looks, which, with sadness, compassion, sighs, nay, even absolute silence itself, are made the groundwork of suspicion. Is a citizen popular? He is a rival of the dictator, and might excite commotions. Does he, on the other hand, avoid society, and live retired in the bosom of his family? This secluded life makes him remarked, and excites the suspicion that he is meditating sinister designs. Are you rich? There is imminent peril that the people may be corrupted by your largesses. Are you poor? You must be the more closely watched, because there is none so enterprising as those who have nothing to lose. Are you of a thoughtful and melancholy character, with a neglected exterior? You are afflicted because in your opinion public affairs are not well conducted. Does a citizen indulge in dissipation and bring on indigestion? He is concealing ambition under the mask of pleasure. Is he virtuous and austere in his morals? He has constituted himself the censor of the government. Is he a philosopher, an orator, a poet? He will soon acquire more consideration than the rulers of the state. Has he acquired reputation in war? His talents only make him the more dangerous, and render it indispensable to remove him from the army, perhaps to send him to the scaffold. The natural death of a distinguished person, particularly if in place, has become so rare that his-

torians transmit it as an event worthy of record to future ages. Even the death of so many innocent and estimable citizens seems a less calamity than the insolence and scandalous fortunes of those who have denounced and murdered them. Every day the accuser makes his triumphal entry into the palace of death to reap the harvest of some rich succession; and the tribunals, which were once the protectors of life and property, have become mere slaughter-houses, where that which bears the name of punishment and confiscation is nothing but robbery and murder."

XXXVI. (Page 93.)

Carnot's effort in the following quotation was to show that the government of a single person was anything rather than a guaranty of stability and tranquillity:

"The duration of the Roman empire was not longer than that of the republic would have been; the intestine disorders were still greater, and crimes more multiplied; republican highmindedness, heroism, and all the masculine virtues were displaced to make room for the most ridiculous pride, the vilest adulation, the most insatiable cupidity, and the most complete disregard of national prosperity. What evil, pray, was remedied or obviated by declaring the succession to the throne hereditary? Was not this in fact regarded as the legitimate inheritance of the house of Augustus? Was not Domitian the son of Vespasian, Caligula the son of Germanicus, Commodus the son of Marcus Aurelius?"

XXXVII. (Page 94.)

The subsequent history of France down to the present republic is, in brief, the following:

The imperial government of Napoleon lasted exactly one hundred days. During that period the emperor expended six hundred million francs, and sacrificed sixty thousand lives. Louis XVIII. was called by the political leaders to the throne after the fall of Napoleon. The people did not object, for they were tired of the bloody scenes through which they had passed.

After the reigns of Louis XVIII., Charles X., and Louis-Philippe I. (1848-1852), a provisional government, at the flight of this last king, assumed control of state affairs until the appointment of the constitutional assembly. This body proclaimed a republic. The bloody times of 1848 led to placing General Cavaignac in supreme power. In December of the same year, Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte was

elected president of the republic, and in December, 1852, by vote of a plebiscite, the empire of France was re-established, and Napoleon III. became emperor.

XXXVIII. (Page 94.)

There are other extinct republics of such brief duration as hardly to justify extended treatment. Such, for instance, was the republic or "commonwealth" which sprang out of the English revolution. It lasted but eleven years, and was followed by the restoration of the Stuart dynasty.

To this class likewise belongs the democratic-republican form of government in Spain in 1873, which, however, was merely an "episode in a series of revolutions and reactions."

XXXIX. (Page 101.)

Facts involved in the history of Switzerland, from 1300 to 1800, may be of interest.

The Swiss confederation of 1308 was founded by the three cantons of Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwald. In 1353 it numbered eight cantons, and in 1513 it was composed of thirteen. This old confederation of thirteen cantons was increased by the adherence of several subject territories, and existed till 1798, when it was replaced by the Helvetic republic, which lasted four years. In 1803 Napoleon I., by the addition of St. Gall, Graubünden, Aargau, Thurgau, Tessin, and Vaud, organized a new confederation, composed of nineteen cantons. This confederation was modified in 1815, when the number of cantons was increased to twenty-two by the admission of Wallis, Neuchâtel, and Genève. Three of the cantons are politically divided, — Basel into Stadt and Land, or town and country; Appenzell into Ausser Rhoden and Inner Rhoden, or exterior and interior; and Unterwald into Obwald and Nidwald, or upper and lower. Their union is preserved by each of the moieties sending one member to the state council, so that there are two members to the divided as well as the undivided cantons.

XL. (Page 104.)

In addition to the schools already mentioned, there are normal schools in all the cantons for training schoolmasters. There are four universities in Switzerland. Basel has a university founded in 1460, and since 1832 universities have been established in Bern and Zürich. In the summer of 1879, Basel had fifty-two professors, and one hundred and ninety-four students; Bern eighty professors, and four hundred

and five students; and Zürich seventy-seven professors, and three hundred and eight students. These three universities are organized on the model of the high schools of Germany, governed by a rector and a senate, and are divided into four departments of theology, jurisprudence, philosophy, and medicine. There is a polytechnic school at Zürich, founded in 1855, which possesses a philosophic faculty and forty-six teachers, and a military academy at Thun, both maintained by the Federal government.

XLI. (Page 108.)

The early history of France will be found upon page 89.

XLII. (Page 108.)

We are indebted to the "Statesman's Year-Book," 1880, for the following list of the sovereigns and governments of France from the accession of the House of Bourbon:

House of Bourbon. — Henry IV., 1589–1610; Louis XIII. ("le Juste"), 1610–1643; Louis XIV. ("le Grand"), 1643–1715; Louis XV., 1715–1774; Louis XVI. († 1793), 1774–1792.

First Republic. — Convention, 1792–1795; Directoire, 1795–1799; Consulate, 1799–1804.

Empire. — Napoleon I. († 1821), 1804–1814.

House of Bourbon Restored. — Louis XVIII., 1814–1824; Charles X. († 1836), 1824–1830.

House of Bourbon (Orleans). — Louis Philippe († 1850), 1830–1848.

Second Republic. — Provisional government, February to December, 1848; Louis Napoleon, president, 1848–1852.

Empire Restored. — Napoleon III. († 1873), 1852–1870.

Third Republic. — Government of National Defence, 1870–1871; Louis A. Thiers, president, 1871–1873; Marshal MacMahon, president, 1873–1879; F. J. P. Jules Grevy, president, 1879.

It thus appears that the average duration of the eighteen governments of France since the accession of the House of Bourbon is sixteen years.

XLIII. (Page 118.)

Says Charles Maclaren, F.R.S.:

"The problem as to the source whence America derived its population presents no difficulty now when the contiguity of the old and the

new continent at Behring's Straits is known. The breadth of the sea here (latitude 66°) is only forty-five English miles; the transit across is facilitated by two islands placed almost exactly midway between Asia and America; and in severe winters, a firm body of ice joins the two continents. The climate, though rigorous, does not prevent the country on each side from being inhabited. The Aleutian Isles, besides, at the latitude of 53°, which run in a line like the piers of an immense bridge, from one continent to the other, present such easy means of communication, that few savage tribes a little familiar with sea-life could be long in Kamtschatka without threading their way across the Pacific to the peninsula of Alaska. Indeed, if a doubt could exist, we have positive proof that America received part of its population from the northeast extremity of Asia; for the Esquimaux, living on the east side of Behring's Straits, speak a language which is radically the same with that of the Tschutskoi on the opposite shores."

XLIV. (Page 132.)

Dr. Robert Brown, in his "Countries of the World," says:

"There is a nobility in Brazil, but it only dates from 1822, the year of the declaration of independence, and possesses no special privileges, either social or legislative. Titles, moreover, can only be held for one generation, the rank dying with the father, unless the son can establish a claim to the distinction on the same ground as those for which his father obtained it. These are the Brazilian 'peers.' But in reality there are a great many others who enjoy a sort of brevet rank. These are gentlemen who are descended from noble families in Portugal, who are very wealthy. Such claims to be admitted into the aristocracy are readily acquiesced in by 'society.' There are three degrees of nobility — marquis, count, and baron — in addition to the title of knight (*mocos fidalgos*) obtained by admission into any one of the six orders of chivalry founded or adopted by the present emperor and his father. As usual with such 'distinctions,' a cross is very easily obtained, and the emperor's numerous visits to Europe have resulted in that of the 'rose' dangling from the button-holes of some very obscure representatives of the equestrian rank, even of Brazil. The result is that the aristocracy, being continually recruited from the democracy, and liable at any time to return to the rank from which they sprang, do not consider themselves a superior race of beings, except in so far that they are, for the most part, the pick of the population of the country."

XLV. (Page 149.)

The author is indebted for many of the facts concerning existing republics to "The Statesman's Year-Book," 1880, which is surprisingly full of the latest and most reliable information.

XLVI. (Page 170.)

If the reader will consult the records of crime in the United States, he will be astonished at the number of criminals who are American-born, and who have been more or less under the training of our public schools.

XLVII. (Page 173.)

It would well repay the historical student to read the history of our republic with the thought of providential interposition constantly in mind. We hope that some one will write a book bearing the title — "God in American History."

XLVIII. (Page 184.)

At the first election under the present French republic, the bishops, though they had but ten days to prepare for elections, were ready. They had their lists made out, and sent them to the parish priests. The peasants did not know the men they were ordered to vote for, but the priest said, "These are gentlemen who are ready for peace; these are the men for whom you must vote."

XLIX. (Page 191.)

Late private despatches from Rome complete the information regarding the secession of Rev. Arthur Wagner, the Ritualist of Brighton. There is no doubt whatever that Wagner, by advice of Orby Shipley, has been secretly received. Wagner's conversion is supposed to mark the beginning of a long-impending and carefully prepared movement which may ere long bring many of the ritualistic Anglican clergy over to Roman Catholicism. Meeting ground has been found that may unite the timid High-Church Anglicans of the Mackonochie, Tooth, and Wagner stamp with the Vatican.

Wagner's church and several others were never consecrated; hence they are not within the jurisdiction of the bishop of Chichester. These churches are likely to be gained to Rome, but the conversion of Wagner and his imitators is conditional. In the first place, those converts

who are already married are to be reordained (*sub tacita conditione*); second, such converts will be allowed to assist in ministering in Catholic churches in mass, benediction, preaching, and catechism, but will not be admitted for the present to parochial functions, especially to confessions; third, males and females in Anglican religious orders are to pass through novitiate under experienced superiors appointed by Rome, and at the end of their novitiate are to be professed with simple vows, and will continue the philanthropic work under the Vatican jurisdiction; fourth, special metropolitan — perhaps Cardinal Manning — is to be consecrated by the Pope himself for the government of reconciled, reordained Anglican clergy; fifth, for the present, parts of service outside the canon of the mass are to be allowed in the vernacular, the congregation of rites deciding which portions of the old Salisbury rite are to be incorporated with the liturgy; sixth, the younger clergy are to take the usual vows of celibacy when ordained subdeacons; the converts will be allowed and encouraged, if they prefer, to adopt the usual mass of Latin.

It is sometimes asked, Why do intelligent people turn Romanists? Dr. Storrs answers thus:

"Romanism appeals to educated Protestants: 1. As offering an authoritative teacher, always present, in which the mind of God himself resides and is revealed. 2. As presenting a solid, consistent, satisfying theology. 3. As bringing the scriptural world more closely to their minds, and making their relations to it more intimate. 4. As giving greater security of salvation. 5. As offering a higher and the only true sanctity of spirit and of life. 6. As showing a long and venerable history. 7. As welcoming and cherishing all the fine arts, and making them its constant helpers. 8. As promising to rebuild and purify society, and at last to possess and regenerate the world."

L. (Page 191.)

In a work which Rev. Mgr. de Haerne, of the English College of Bruges, has just had published, showing the progress of Catholicism among people of Anglo-Saxon origin, some highly-interesting statistics are given of the extension of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. According to this authority, when the first Catholic bishopric was established in this country (1790), there were only thirty thousand Catholics in a total population of more than three millions. The ratio of Catholics was then as one to one hundred. During the next fifty years a great change took place, and the Catholic population, from thirty thousand, advanced to about one million five hundred thousand, who represented one-eleventh of all the inhabitants.

Within the period ending 1876, the gain was also very great, though, of course, not so rapid proportionately as during the first half-century of our national life. The number of American Roman Catholics in this last year is set down at six millions five hundred thousand, or little less than one sixth of the entire population of the country.

The wealth, influence, and dignity of the church, as represented by its buildings and lands, and by its priests, have been augmented with even greater rapidity than its worshippers. In 1790 there were but thirty-four priests, and hardly a score of church-edifices, while in 1876 there were five thousand three hundred and eighty-eight clergymen, who ministered in eight thousand seven hundred and fifty-seven churches and mission-stations. It is very easy for those who wish to draw the conclusion from these figures that the time is approaching when a numerical majority of the inhabitants of this country will be Roman Catholics, and when, as a natural result, the observance of that religion will be enforced by the state.

Rev. J. L. Spaulding, bishop-elect of Peoria, Ill., said in public, not long since, that no country in the world was of such present interest to Catholics as the United States. The Catholic Church to-day held the mass of the people. He endeavored to trace the relation of present Protestants and Republicans to the original Puritan, Dutch, and Huguenot settlers, and asserted that in politics the Catholics had generally associated themselves with the Democrats, because, when Jefferson founded the Democratic party, he declared emphatically against the connection of Church and State. Lapsing into statistics, the bishop stated that in one hundred years the number of priests in the United States had increased from twenty-five to five thousand, and the church was now the wealthiest in the country, while the number of Catholics had increased in the century of the Republic from a ratio of one in one hundred to one in every six of the people.

Father Hecker, in his very ingenious paper entitled, "The Catholic Church in the United States: its Rise, Relations with the Republic, Growth, and Future Prospects," after presenting the astounding false proposition "that the Roman Catholic Church has battled her whole lifetime for those rights of man and for that liberty which confers the greatest glory on the American Republic," gives a table of statistics which rest probably on a more substantial basis of historic accuracy. This table shows that in 1776 the Roman Catholics were 1-120 part of the whole population, and in 1790 1-107 part; and these figures remind us how very small was their proportion at those dates to the American colonists, who, having laid the foundations of civil and religious freedom on the Christian morality of the Bible, fought the battles of the Revolution and ordained the State and national constitu-

tions. The tables trace the comparative growth to 1878, when the Roman Catholics appear as seven millions to forty, or one-sixth of the whole population. Father Hecker attributes this immense growth, not simply to immigration, but to the greater number of births, and quotes the fact, which, assuming it to be correct, is sufficiently startling, that in Rhode Island the census of 1875 showed that its native American population by parentage had increased only 12.89 per cent. in ten years past, while the foreign population by parentage had increased 80.11 per cent. in the same time. Of the seven millions in 1878, one million two hundred and thirty-seven thousand are assumed to be Germans. Father Hecker further shows that the aggregate wealth of the Roman Church in the United States increased from nine millions in 1850 to twenty-six millions in 1860, and to sixty millions in 1870; and that, while in the first of these decades the wealth of the whole country gained 125 per cent., and that of the Roman Catholic Church 189 per cent., in the second decade the wealth of the country gained 86 per cent., and that of the church 128 per cent.

It may also be noticed that the Roman Catholics, who had scarcely a parochial school in this country twenty-five years ago, have now, according to Sadlier's directory, about seventeen hundred, with two hundred thousand pupils.

LI. (Page 193.)

The views of James Anthony Froude can be studied with profit. He says:

"The first principle of the Republic is that the majority of the whole country shall rule. If the Church of Rome can really convert a majority of the American people, either the principle will have to be set aside, or the church will be within its right in ordering matters as it pleases. We know very little of the conditions of intellectual energy. In the past history of mankind, it has been intermittent. Periods of activity and progress have alternated with periods of rest, as if the mind was like the soil, which requires a respite of stagnation to recover from an exhausting crop. It is possible, it is even likely, that the appetite for change which has characterized the last century may be followed by a wave of spititual and political conservatism, that science will pause for a while in its discoveries, and that our new knowledge may be allowed time to shape itself into a form with some humanity in it. . . . . But that the alarm should have risen among our cousins in the United States — that among them, of all peoples, who are

'The heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time,'

intelligent persons can be found who are really afraid of what may lie before them — is at least remarkable, and gives us a kind of melancholy satisfaction. The Americans, too, are but mortals after all, subject to the same diseases which afflict the worn-out races of the Old World, and they may draw closer to us in the common trial."

LII. (Page 195.)

In a pastoral letter, Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, thus calls attention to the condition of the freedmen:

'As all know, the colored people are not favorably received in the midst of the congregations of the whites. The condition of their children is yet worse. Colored children are nowhere admitted into the schools of the whites, so that almost necessarily they are sent to some sectarian school at the risk of losing their faith, since Protestants are ever on the watch for them. Schools should be provided to which the children of Catholic colored parents may be sent; but from which, at the same time, children of Protestants should not be excluded, that thus their salvation may be secured. These schools should also serve as churches on Sundays for the adult Catholics, that they, too, may comply with their religious duties until a chapel or church can be erected for their use."

The following address of Archbishop Manning, at the consecration of certain missionaries sent to the Southern field, may be interesting:

"These priests go as the vanguard of others who will soon follow, inflamed with the love of souls; souls not lovable for their intelligence and virtue, but souls black with ignorance and vice; lovable only because your Master died for them. You give yourselves forever to be the fathers and servants of the negroes, and to labor exclusively for them until your death, in the spirit of Peter Clavor, who announced himself as forever the slave of the slave."

Each of the missionaries kneeled down, and holding in his hand an open Bible, took this vow of consecration upon himself. The venerable archbishop then arose, prostrated himself before each missionary, embraced his feet, and then arising, kissed each upon both cheeks, receiving a similar kiss in return.

The following item is taken from an issue of the *Montgomery* (Ala.) *Advertiser:*

"The Catholic Church is making a determined effort to extend their educational work in the South. The headquarters of this effort are in Baltimore, where the priests, nuns, and sisters from abroad report, and are detailed to various parts of the South."

A Jesuit, in an unguarded moment, recently said: "We seek the colored man for his vote."

Archbishop Spaulding, in his introduction to the "Life of Archbishop Hughes," lately published, says:

"He who will do most to form the character of the Catholic youth in America will also have done most to mould the future of the American people."

LIII. (Page 200.)

The claim that Popery results in greater moral correctness and purity seems preposterous in view of present and historic facts.

A recent number of *El Solfeo*, an Italian journal of prominence, furnishes the following statistics: In 1870 — that is, before Rome was the capital of the kingdom of Italy — there were in the city (for a population of 205,000 inhabitants) 2,469 secular clergy, among cardinals, bishops, prelates, and *curas;* 2,766 monks, and 2,117 nuns; in all, 7,322 religious of both sexes. The number of births reached in the same year to 4,378, of which 1,215 were legitimate, and 3,163 illegitimate; the illegitimates, therefore, being in the proportion of 75.25 per 100 of the total of births. Comparing Rome with other capitals of Europe, it results that, for every 100 legitimate births, there are illegitimate — in London, 4; in Paris, 48; in Brussels, 9; in Rome, 143.

Nor in regard to capital crime did the Pontifical States occupy a favorable position before they were annexed to Italy by King Victor Emanuel. The statistics corresponding to the latest years of the Pontifical government show that there was committed one murder in England for every 187,000 inhabitants; in Holland, one for every 168,000; in Russia, one for every 100,000; in Austria, one for every 4,113; in Naples, one for every 2,750; and in the estates of the *Pope, one for every* 750.

A recent English paper says that the Roman Catholics in Scotland are less than one-twelfth of the population, yet this one-twelfth furnishes one third of the criminals. In England and Wales, the Roman Catholics are one-twentieth of the population; but the Roman Catholic prisoners are one-fourth of the prisoners.

LIV. (Page 201.)

A distinguished champion of Romanism, Orestes A. Brownson, LL.D., thus frankly spoke of the quality of Roman Catholic schools and colleges:

"They practically fail to recognize human progress. . . . . As far as we have been able to trace the effect of the most approved Catholic

education of our day, whether at home or abroad, it tends to repress rather than quicken the life of the pupil; to unfit rather than prepare for the active and zealous discharge either of his religious or his social duties. They who are educated in our schools seem misplaced and mistimed in the world, as if born and educated for a world that has ceased to exist. . . . . Comparatively few of them (Catholic graduates) take their stand as scholars, or as men, on a level with the Catholics of non-Catholic colleges, and those who do take that stand do it by throwing aside nearly all they learned from their *Alma Mater*, and adopting the ideas and principles, the modes of thought and action, they find in the general civilization of the country in which they live. . . . . The cause of the failure of what we call Catholic education is, in our judgment, in the fact that we educate, not for the present or the future, but for the past."

The following, taken from *Le Pelerin*, a French Catholic journal, is a sample of the kind of instruction given by Roman Catholic chiefs to the common people:

"Upon entering Paradise, he (Pius IX.) received a crown from the hands of the Immaculate Virgin Mary as a reward for the crown he had conferred on her while on earth. St. Joseph, whom he had made the patron and protector of the church, did not fail to shake him cordially by the hand, and thank him. On seeing him enter, St. Peter instantly gave the pitch, and the heavenly choir struck up, while Francis de Sales and Alphonso de Liguori, whom he had proclaimed doctors of the church, extolled, each in turn, the exploits and achievements of his pontificate; and fifty-two saints and twenty-six blessed, who owe to Pius IX. their existing position, regaled him with melodious concerts."

LV. (Page 204.)

The following is the substance of the latest advices from Rome:

Leo XIII. has been studying the state papers of Pius IX. He has decided to adopt an aggressive policy in France, and to take sides with the Jesuits and other unauthorized associations which are to be prosecuted by the government. He discountenances violence, but urges resistance in the law courts, wherever there is ground for contesting the action of the ministry. Now that moderate counsels which came so unexpectedly from the Vatican in the Belgian school controversy have been withheld, the fight between the republicans and clericalism must go on to the end. There has even been a change in the Papal policy in Belgium, for the Liberals are greatly exercised over a letter which Leo XIII. has written to the primate. The *Echo du*

Parlement, the organ of the government, insists on the necessity of demanding explanations from the Pope relative to his recent absolute approval of the conduct of the Belgian bishops in the education question, and his not less absolute condemnation of the new school law. It says that if the Pope has really acted as it seems he has acted, from the declarations of the prelates and the clerical journals, no honest government can maintain relations with him in the future. It appears now that all the reassuring communications made from the Vatican to the Belgian government had no other purpose than to keep the Belgian envoy at Rome.

That the principles which are controlling the Papal Church in its persistent attacks upon civilization may be clearly seen, we present those numbers from "The Encyclical" which have special bearing upon civil government:

XIX. — The Romish Church has a right to exercise its authority without having any limits set to it by the civil power.

XXIV. — The Romish Church has the right to avail itself of force, and to use the temporal power for that purpose.

XXVI. — The Romish Church has an innate and legitimate right to acquire, hold, and use property without limit.

XXVII. — The Pope and the priests ought to have dominion over the temporal affairs.

XXX. — The Romish Church and her ecclesiastics have a right to immunity from civil law.

XXXI. — The Romish clergy should be tried for civil and criminal offences only in ecclesiastical courts.

XXXIX. — The people are not the source of all civil power.

XLII. — In case of conflict between the ecclesiastical and civil powers, the ecclesiastical powers ought to prevail.

XLV. — The Romish Church has the right to interfere in the discipline of the public schools, and in the arrangement of the studies of the public schools, and in the choice of the teachers for these schools.

XLVII. — Public schools open to all children for the education of the young should be under the control of the Romish Church, and should not be subject to the civil power, nor made to conform to the opinions of the age.

XLVIII. — While teaching primarily the knowledge of natural things, the public schools must not be separated from the faith and power of the Romish Church.

LIII. — The civil power has no right to assist persons to regain their freedom who have once adopted a religious life; that is, become priests, monks, or nuns.

LIV. — The civil power is inferior and subordinate to the ecclesiastical power, and in litigated questions of jurisdiction should yield to it.

LV. — Church and State should be united.

LXXVIII. — The Roman Catholic religion should be the only religion of the state, and all other modes of worship should be excluded.

LVI. (Page 205.)

These cases referred to are very suggestive. They show that Popery is the same the world over. That Massachusetts is so much like Belgium ought, however, to attract the attention of even the most careless observer. In Belgium it will be remembered that a law was enacted some time since prohibiting the giving of religious instruction in the schools within school hours, but allowing the priests to teach such children as might be sent by their parents for that purpose, out of school hours. The Belgium bishops thereupon forbade the priests to give instruction in them; and refused the sacraments to teachers, scholars, and parents. In St. Mary's Parish, Cambridgeport, Mass., over which Father Scully presides, is the same intolerance. For attending a public school after the priest had commanded attendance at a parochial school, a boy was stretched upon a table, and his back lashed till for two weeks the child could not lie down on account of his wounds. "*That*," as Joseph Cook says, "under the shadow of Bunker Hill; that within sound of the guns where our Revolutionary history began; that under the very towers of our foremost university; that within sight of these cultured streets of Boston; that above the very graves of Cotton Mather and of his associates who planted the free-school system in the rocky soil of New England!"

The other case is that of Father Dufresne, a parish priest at Holyoke, Mass., who attempted to ruin the business of a former parishioner, whom he had excommunicated because of some slight disobedience.

LVII. (Page 205.)

Says the *Catholic World*:

"We, of course, deny the competency of the State to educate, to say what shall or shall not be taught in the public schools, as we deny its competency to say what shall or shall not be the religious belief and discipline of its citizens. We, of course, utterly repudiate the popular doctrine that so-called secular education is the function of the State." Again: "Religious liberty consists in the unrestrained freedom and independence of the church to teach and govern all men

and nations, princes and peoples, rulers and ruled, in all things enjoined by the teleological law of man's existence." Again: "Before God, no man has a right to be of any religion but the Catholic, the only true religion, the only religion by which men can be raised to union with God in the beatific vision."

In a paper entitled, "The Catholics of the Nineteenth Century," we read:

"The supremacy asserted for the church in matters of education implies the additional and cognate functions of the censorship of ideas, and the right to examine and approve, or disapprove, all books, publications, writings, and utterances intended for public instruction, enlightenment, or entertainment, and the supervision of places of amusement."

LVIII. (Page 209.)

The same spirit is manifested in other countries:

"Had we still a king," says M. About, "they would thrust a confessor and ministers upon him. The sovereignty of the people having been declared, much to their mortification, they will not acknowledge themselves beaten, and they are marching gayly to storm universal suffrage. As the leaders of the democracy are, and always will be, recruited from the middle classes, among self-made men, the Jesuits have resolved to gain possession of the middle classes; what little remains of the nobility being already on their side. . . . . Nine thousand youths (in French Jesuit schools) are being prepared by them as candidates for civil-service appointments, or for the liberal professions. They imbue their minds with the purest monarchical spirit; they teach them to treat with contempt the fundamental principles on which modern society has been built."

The French government, therefore, defends its attack upon the Jesuits on this impregnable ground, that the Republic has the right to protect itself, and that the followers of Loyola infect the people with disloyalty.

LIX. (Page 212.)

On the 29th of September, 1876, General Grant, at the reunion of the army of the Tennessee, employed these significant words:

"If we are to have another national contest, I predict that the dividing line will not be Mason and Dixon's, but between Protestantism and intelligence on the one side, and superstition and ignorance on the other."

LX (Page 220.)

The terms Socialism and Communism are not exactly synonymous. President Woolsey has correctly represented Proudhon as a most pronounced Socialist, though a sharp critic of communism. Dr. Hitchcock agrees with President Woolsey, remarking that communism is related to socialism as species to genus. "All Communists are Socialists; but not all Socialists are Communists." Communism maintains the theory that all right to property should be vested in the State. Practically, it would abolish all private property. Socialism, in theory, would retain the right to private property, and to a limited increase according to the capacity and industry of the individual, along with large common possessions on the part of the State; but it would give the State absolute control over the operations of industry and commerce, revolutionizing the relations of capital and labor so as to secure a larger share of profit to the latter than is obtained at present.

Political communism, as now understood, is a movement directed by political agitators, with a view of obtaining the power of the State, and of putting in force, on a national scale, the radical principles of communism, first in financial and industrial matters, and next in matters of social ethics and religion. Communistic leaders and their followers, however sincere in their views and aims, are usually free-religionists, or no-religionists.

The late Dr. Thompson, who for several years has been a thoughtful and calm observer of the political and social movements of Europe, not long before his death, published a paper entitled, "A Moral Quarantine." In view of the immigration into our communities of tens of thousands of German Socialists whom their own country can no longer endure, he predicts much trouble. He represents these men as inflamed with the fever of license, with hatred to God and all established authority; as the open enemies of the Bible, the Sabbath, the home, of marriage, and of society itself. Dr. Thompson reasons that the law which enables this country to defend itself from infected animals and rags will also, upon similar grounds, permit a moral quarantine.

Communism has a suggestive history. In one form or another it dates a long way back. It has been found among the Hindoos, the Egyptians, and the Jews. Plato advocated the theory in his ideal republic. He desired to have all the land owned by the State, and common use and common privilege enjoyed in education and in the various matters of social life.

"There were to be neither rich persons nor poor, for the State was to provide equally for all; neither was the exclusiveness of birth nor of other fortuitous inequalities to be allowed to break the easy bonds by which all citizens, both male and female, could be bound together in one harmonious commonwealth."

Sir Thomas More, in his Utopia, dreamed of a state communistic in its organization. The details of government in his happy island were carried out by a body of magistrates appointed by popular election. To this governing body was delegated the duty of distributing the instruments and apportioning the tasks of productive industry among all the people, while the wealth resulting from their united and easy labors went to form a public fund, in which all equally participated. There was no want nor scarcity, for every citizen must work; and yet no fatigue nor weariness, for the daily hours of labor did not exceed six. There was no use for money, as food and all necessaries were supplied from the common stock. Meals were laid out in public, for all to share alike, and they were rendered more enjoyable by the accompaniment of sweet strains of music, and the scent of delicate perfumes.

The first perhaps to formulate in a distinct manner the modern doctrine of communism, in extreme terms, was Babeuf, in his journal *Le Tribun du Peuple*, 1794–1796. His theory was the following: "There shall be no differences other than those of age and sex. All men have nearly the same faculties and the same needs; they ought, consequently, to have the same education and the same food."

Robert Owen, a man of wealth, spent his fortune and life in endeavors to establish schemes of industry more or less communistic. His agricultural community at New Harmony, Ind., though continued for a time, entirely disappointed his expectations, and he thus described the result: "I wanted," he said, "honesty of purpose, and I got dishonesty. I wanted temperance, and instead I was continually troubled with the intemperate. I wanted industry, and I found idleness. I wanted carefulness, and I found waste. I wanted to find a desire for knowledge, and I found apathy. I wanted the principles of the formation of character understood, and I found them misunderstood."

Were all men righteous and equal in ability, then communism, as represented in the ideal republic of Plato and in the Utopia of More, and as worked for by modern theorists, would be an admirable system. But as men are constituted, communism will never end better than Owen's community at New Harmony.

LXI. (Page 221.)

A table of wages and the cost of living, with the price of staple articles of commerce, going back as far as the year 1200, has been lately published. It shows that wages during the thirteenth century were about fifty cents a week. In the next century they advanced some fifteen cents, and continued to advance slowly until in the last century they reached one dollar and eighty-seven cents per week. Wheat in the thirteenth century averaged seventy-one cents, or eight and a half days' labor a bushel.

In the United States, a common day-laborer now receives more than a bushel of wheat for a single day's labor. In six centuries, meat has not quite trebled in price, while wages have increased more than sevenfold.

LXII. (Page 222.)

Some of the representative men who have held office in New York within a few years are thus described by the *New York World:*

"Thomas Dunlap, a commissioner of jurors, with a salary of fifteen thousand dollars a year, began life as a dog-catcher, gained influence as a rumseller, and passed from a gin-mill to a position where he practically has charge of the jury-system of the city. Four aldermen keep one or two saloons each, and two of them keep 'bucket-shops' and 'all-night' dens. Richard Crocker, coroner, with twelve thousand dollars a year, has been a prize-fighter, and only escaped conviction for the crime of murder through his influence in Tammany counsels. Richard Flanigan, another coroner at twelve thousand dollars a year, has been a prize-fighter, and is a gambler. Jerry Hartigan, another member of the committee, has been tried for murder. The list might be extended, but a few shining examples suffice to show what a city may expect which allows itself to be governed by the Democratic party."

LXIII. (Page 223.)

A striking parallel could be drawn between the fashionable women of the United States and those of the Roman republic. (See page 42.) Most cases of fraud during late years have sprung, it must be admitted, from "a hunger for home magnificence or display."

The Roman republic was compelled once to pass a law forbidding the consuls from going in processions with white horses. The empire had done enough of that. The people had seen the tax-lists and the wars and the bribes that came from splendor, and they ordained by

law that their republic should make an experiment in simplicity. But the law was vain. The barbarian love of display was all through and through the people. To gratify their taste they would sack any city, and strip the rings from the dying women, or gold from the altars of the gods. When Rome died it was full of furniture and tapestry and marbles, but empty of soul. No men or women of mind and of virtue had trodden its elegant parlors for a hundred years. When high style comes in at the door, reason flies out at the window.

Confucius, speaking of the ancients, says:

"Their families being regulated, their states were rightly governed. Their states being rightly governed, the whole empire was made tranquil and happy."

LXIV. (Page 228.)

The more history is studied the more will it appear that some men cannot be kept safe except by rigor. There are those who do not seem to know when they are well used. It is noteworthy that the czars whose lives have been oftenest in danger are those who have appeared most deserving. Ivan the Terrible and Nicholas I., unquestionably the two greatest tyrants in Russian history, were never assailed, while the present czar has been aimed at five times, and his liberal and popular uncle, Alexander I., is still believed to have died by poison. Even Peter the Great, "the Father of Russia," had no fewer than three escapes from assassination.

Mr. Froude, in his last article in the "North American Review," says:

"The line of human progress is the equation of the compound forces of freedom and authority. Freedom runs into anarchy; authority runs into tyranny. By the endless jar of these two tendencies the course of advance is traced out. It pleases us to say that all men have a natural right to liberty. But perhaps those only have a right to liberty who deserve it, and can use it well. We say that all men are equal. We say it to no purpose if nature has made us unequal. We say that all men have an equal right to a voice in the state. It may be that only the wise and competent have a right to have a voice in it at all; that the majority are as little able to choose their ablest statesmen as to choose their ablest artist, philosopher, poet, religious teacher. . . . The rights of man are, we know not what. The responsibilities of men are practical realities, which find us out at every false step which we take. . . . It is the fashion to say that the modern man is free; that submission to authority is mean and servile. On the contrary, it is precisely as men understand what real freedom means that

they submit to what is better than themselves; and those who clamor loudest for their rights are those who have fewest rights which deserve to be respected."

LXV. (Page 229.)

Some of the quotations of letters from Macaulay to H. S. Randall, author of the "Life of Jefferson," are of great weight coming from so learned an observer. In a letter dated May 23, 1857, we read:

"You are surprised to learn that I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson, and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain that I never wrote a line, and I never, in Parliament, in conversation, or even on the hustings — a place where it is the fashion to court the populace — uttered a word indicating an opinion that the supreme authority in a State ought to be intrusted to the majority of citizens; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society. I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must sooner or later destroy liberty or civilization, or both. In Europe, where the population is dense, the effect of such institutions would be almost instantaneous. . . . . You may think that your country enjoys an exemption from these evils. I will frankly own to you that I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World, and while that is the case, the Jefferson politics may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity. But the time will come when New England will be as thickly peopled as old England. Wages will be as low, and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams, and in those Manchesters and Birminghams hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. . . . . It is quite plain that your Government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority. For with you the majority is the Government, and has the rich, who are always a minority, absolutely at its mercy. The day will come when in the State of New York a multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink cham-

pagne and ride in a carriage while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessaries. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by a workingman who hears his children cry for more bread? I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such season of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like people who should in a year of scarcity devour all the seed-corn, and thus make the next a year, not of scarcity, but of absolute famine. There will be, I fear, spoliation. The spoliation will increase the distress. The distress will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stop you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when a society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Cæsar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman empire was in the fifth, with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

LXVI. (Page 231.)

The acknowledgment must be made that the first threat of secession came from New England during the first term of Washington's administration. The facts were these: The New England members in Congress had brought forward a proposition for the assumption by the General government of certain war debts of the States. The Southern States had largely paid their debts, while the debts of the New England States had mostly been bought up at a large discount by speculators, some of whom, a Northern historian tells us, were then in Congress. The proposition was rejected by Southern votes. Great excitement followed. New England threatened to secede, and Congress could do no business but adjourn from day to day, and its dissolution was imminent. Through the management of Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Hamilton, a compromise was brought about, and "the Union was saved;" the war debts of New England were paid, and the national capital was located on the Potomac instead of farther north.

The threat of secession now comes from California. Says a leading San Francisco paper:

"Already such a dread possibility as secession from the Union, in the event of our failure to obtain the relief we demand from the Chinese evil, is broadly talked of in high circles. Leading men say that we have pleaded, have exhausted arguments, have cried aloud for

relief, but our most earnest appeals have been treated with indignity, and our sufferings been made a mockery. As a last resort, we will take advantage of the geographical lines that surround us, the vast extent of soil within our boundaries, the exhaustless resources of wealth that are ours, and will set up an Occidental republic, which, if it cannot rival the old republic in its glory of the past, will at least be a magnificent empire of white freemen, whose heritage shall be preserved to their children and their children's children forever."

Once admit the doctrine of State rights, and the sovereign right of New England or of the Pacific States to withdraw from the Federal compact would be established. Soon there would not be two governments merely, but many. Any group of states, or any great city, on the ground of some real or imaginary injustice, or from purely selfish interests, under the leadership of ambitious demagogues, would break the Federal compact.

LXVII. (Page 237.)

This to many persons may seem strong language. But volunteer soldiers often wonder what really was gained by all their sacrifices. The colored people have received very little benefit. They flee from the South overground rather than underground: this appears to be the chief difference. Surprisingly few of the "Grand Army of the Republic," on account of their military services, are admitted to management or emoluments of our civil offices. The honor of having been a soldier is recognized in the South, but in the North there is not much account taken of it. Facts like these lead many of the men who fought most faithfully to say, "Were there another war, we would remain at home, run no risks, and make money."

LXVIII. (Page 240.)

In answer to the statement that Washington's and Jefferson's rule, to appoint the able, promote the worthy, and never remove the worthy for merely partisan reasons, will result in an aristocracy of office-holders, it has been well said "that such an aristocracy as would not be turned out or put in by party patronage, and not be changed with the administrations, would serve both political parties, and so be no aristocracy at all."

LXIX. (Page 241.)

It is interesting to note how much alike are demagogues in all ages, whether royal sons or brutes. Absalom, as described in the Book of Samuel, is a type of what is found in every commonwealth of

the United States. He is represented as addressing those who are in trouble, telling them it is the fault of the existing government. "See," he says, "thy matters are good and right, but there is no man deputed of the king to hear them." He ascribes the sufferings of the people, their losses, the hard times, to existing rulers, and persuades the people that a change of government will remove every evil. "Oh, that I were made judge in the land! that every man which hath any suit or cause might come unto me, and I would do him justice." He persuaded the Israelites that all they needed was a change; that David had been in power too long; and that a new administration would make things right. Absalom is also represented as seeking popularity by making himself familiar with every one, shaking hands with everybody, so that, "when any man came nigh to him to do him obeisance, he put forth his hand, and took him and kissed him." So Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel. These are the common arts of the selfish demagogue in all times. They flatter the people, pander to their prejudices, encourage their hostility to other classes of society, and kiss the hands and feet of the foulest men.

Another typical demagogue has already been referred to — Cleon of Athens. He was fierce in invective, a ready and able speaker, and was thoroughly acquainted with all the tricks of the forum. Cleon was able to find fault with all in power. He threatened them with criminal accusations, and took bribes to let them off. He obtained power by inspiring terror, by promising rewards to his friends, and threats of punishment to his enemies.

Shakspeare's Jack Cade is a third remarkable type of a demagogue. He is represented as promising that every man in England shall have all he wants; that all the lands of England shall be held in common; that all shall have the best to eat and drink and wear. He has the usual hatred which demagogues have for knowledge. He decrees that all lawyers shall be killed; that all who can read and write shall be hanged; and that he will spare only those who wear cowhide boots and have hard hands. The reader will find no difficulty in meeting with the descendants of these three types of demagogism.

LXX. (Page 245.)

It is a question whether the modern club and caucus are not doing far more mischief than good.

It was during the later times of the Roman republic that "the majority of the people went to the public shops of barbers, and to the shops of physicians, which were great places of resort in the morning,

when numbers of idle loungers assembled there, and talked over the news of the day."

When Cyrus was at Saidis, he was warned not to injure any city of Hellas lest the Lacedæmonians should interfere.

"I was never yet afraid of men," said Cyrus, "who have a place set apart in the middle of this city, where they meet to cheat one another, and to forswear themselves."

LXXI. (Page 246.)

Carl Schurz, speaking of the condition of our politics, says:

"Men of the highest character and ability are not unfrequently discarded as 'too good' to be candidates for public employment, because they could not obtain the support of the lower class of politicians: the moral tone of politics is becoming so low as to repel many of the best citizens from active participation in public life; and political parties, especially when they grow old, show a tendency to resolve themselves into class corporations, to whom the possession of power and 'public plunder' is the first, and the promotion of the public interest only a secondary object."

LXXII. (Page 246.)

Resolutions just adopted by the Democratic party of New York are representative:

"The Democratic party of New York renew their fidelity to the principles set forth by the National Democratic Convention at St. Louis, and approved by decisive popular majorities in the presidential election in 1876. The victory then won was in the name and for the sake of reform. The people were defrauded of the fruits of that victory by a false count of the electoral votes. . . . . The Democratic party of New York also declare their settled conviction that the success of that conspiracy against the people's constitutional sovereignty, which, by perjuries, forgeries, bribes, and violence, in effect disfranchised 4,300,416 voting citizens, and which, by a false count of the electoral votes, reversed the result of the last presidential election, compels the next to turn upon a single commanding issue. That issue precedes and dwarfs every other. . . . . A government of the people, for the people, must be a government by the people. The lawful exercise and orderly transfer of the people's power through the successive administrations of the Government prescribed by the people's choice, is the fundamental condition of a representative Democratic republic. It is the political object for which constitutions and laws are framed;

it is that for which a republic is anywhere preferred above a monarchy, where the transfer is by hereditary succession as an escape from usurped magistracies and civil wars; it is the substance of civil liberty; as for democracy (the people's rule), the people's right to rule, it is the very breath of its life. This, then, is the momentous issue, the right of the people to exercise and enjoy an elective self-government without impediment by force or fraud from any quarter, least of all by fraud and force from their temporary but discarded servants."

This sounds very much like injured innocence!

LXXIII. (Page 247.)

Washington, in his memorable "Farewell," employs this language:

"The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual, and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his compititors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty."

Date Due

JUL 8 '55

HOLY NAMES COLLEGE LIBRARY
00027969

JC
421
T7

S
28567

Townsend, Luther T.
Fate of Republics.

DATE	ISSUED TO
JUL 8 '55	M. A. McNamara

JC
421
T7

Townsend

S
28567

00027969